

THE
Just Scrutiny:
Or, a Serious ENQUIRY into the
MODERN NOTIONS
OF THE
S O U L.

- I. Consider'd as *Breath of Life*, or a *Power* (not *Immaterial Substance*) united to **BODY**, according to the **H. Scriptures**.
- II. As a *Principle Naturally Mortal*, but *Immortaliz'd by its Union with the Baptismal Spirit*, according to *Platonisme* lately *Christianiz'd*.

With a Comparative Disquisition
Between the *Scriptural* and *Philosophic State*
of the *Dead*; and some Remarks on the
Consequences of such Opinions.

By **W. C. M. D.**
William Coward, A.D.

*Inde furor Vulgo, quod Numina Vicinorum
Odit Uterq; Locus, quia Solos credat habendos
Esse Deos quos ipse colit—*

Juv. Sat. xv.

LONDON: Printed for John Chantry, at the Sign of Lin-
colns-Inn-Square near Lincolns-Inn-Fields.

Phil 6:33

But ye shall not say,

that we will not be tempted;

for ye are in the world,

ye are flesh and blood,

ye are yet in the world.

Ye shall not say,

that we will not be tempted;

for ye are in the world,

ye are flesh and blood,

ye are yet in the world.

Ye shall not say,

that we will not be tempted;

for ye are in the world,

ye are flesh and blood,

ye are yet in the world.

Ye shall not say,

that we will not be tempted;

for ye are in the world,

ye are flesh and blood,

ye are yet in the world.

The Just Scrutiny, &c.

The First Letter.

To the Reverend W——m C——ck,
D. D. and Rector of Sl——ge in
Gl——shire.

S I R,

AFTER your Kind Admonitions, and Friendly Exhortations (such *precious Balms as did not break my Head*) to consider and well weigh with my self the Consequences of my Notion of *Human Soul*, which I had fram'd from the Mosaic Doctrine of the Creation of Man, I began seriously to reflect on the Good or Bad Consequences (supposing my Notion were undeniably true) this my Opinion might have on Religion, or Morality. Upon this account, I design'd *totally* to have desisted from intermeddling any more in Theologi-

cal Controversies, and that purely by your Perswasion, whose Candour, and Christian Æquanimity I highly value, and not out of any Threats or Menaces I dreaded for Publishing, and Espousing this Opinion; which I am so well satisfied, is every way consonant to the Doctrine of the *Holy Scriptures*, and the *Christian Faith*, as well as *Right Reason*.

I am very sensible, that had it been in the power of Man to have found out a *Real Ill Consequence* thereby, which might subvert the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion, or teach Men, really govern'd by Reason, and the true Principles of Christianity, to have deviated from Both, you could and would have done it. And I must confess, your attempt to convince me of something Erroneous in my Doctrine of the *Soul*, perhaps had been in some measure effectual, had you proceeded farther, fully to have explain'd to me, that Text of *Gen. 2. 7.* as you thought you could do to my satisfaction. For, if the Light I have thence taken be once made Darkness, I will own, that I have grop'd with an unavoidable Blindness after Truth; but until a clear and evident explication of that Text be made, upon which hinge depends the whole Controversy, together with those comparative Texts relating to *Beasts and Creeping Things*,

Things, Gen. ch. 6. v. 17. and ch. 7. v. 15, 21, 22. I cannot help believing my Opinion, and Doctrine thereon grounded, to be True.

Nor do I forget with what Candour, what *Spirit of Meekness* (that Stranger to *some* Clergymen) you treated me, and *almost* perswaded me to be a Convert, at least under such limitations to believe my Notion as you cou'd propose, and not in the general as I had declared it; I heartily wish you had been pleas'd to discover then to me your conceal'd Reasons, which you presum'd might in great measure satisfy my Scruples in this Controversy, I am sure the Obligation of above 30 Years intimate Friendship and Acquaintance; besides, that Moderate and Christian Temper you treat all Mankind with, be they Dissenters, or not, would have added very much to the weight of your Argumentation, and have made me over-look Reasons in the lesser Degree that I have urg'd, in Defence of my Notion of the *Soul*. For I am not so obstinate, and perverse in defending my Opinion, as to be deaf to all Reasoning, and shut my Ears against any Argumentation whatever; but if some Almighty Church-men presume to deliver their Dictates, as absolute convincing Arguments, in *Thunder and Lightning*, by vertue of more than an ordinary Spirit-

tual Power deriv'd from Heaven, I *must* and *will* tell Them, that it is a wrong way to work a Conviction, and that *They Know not what Spirit They are of*, when nothing but *Fire from Heaven*, that is, Menaces from the Pulpit, and Ecclesiastick Power are thought proper Instruments to illuminate a darkn'd Understanding.

I remember you told me 'twas your hard fate to be reflected on some times by rigid Dissenters for being a Papist; and by some Church-men, nay, even amongst your own Brethren for being a Fanatick; yet, as oft as I have heard you talk of Both with that evenness of Temper, as becomes a Good Christian, without reflecting or reviling either; I am not a little amaz'd that so Pious, and Good a Man, should lie so long buried in Oblivion, as it were, in a Country Village, and not be perswaded to exert Himself, to be more serviceable to the Good of the Church, than you possibly can be where you are. I very well esteem'd your Caution, so frequently inculcated to me, how tender I ought to be of all *Innovations in Religion*, when you were pleas'd to give that undeserv'd Character of a *Scholar*, and a Man of that Parts and Abilities of Learning, as to be, (if I pleas'd) able to make a weak Argument look formidable and strong to some Men, when as others
would

would perhaps but trifle in managing one on the same Point, and turn of a Controversy. The consideration of your Pious Caution kept me silent till now, especially when you were pleas'd to add upon the same Head, *That you valued no Mans Philosophical Doctrine or Opinion, so that the Foundations of the Christian Religion were not thereby shaken, or Morality destroy'd or discountenanc'd*; but I having been frequently rail'd at from the Pulpit, and the Press, by Men of violent and unreasonable Tempers, as an *Atheist, Hobbist, and an Endeavourer to Subvert the very Foundation of Christianity*, I look'd on my self to be so unworthily, and so frequently provok'd, that I could not forbear any longer publishing to the World my own Vindication; because a Pulpit-railery cannot, nay, ought not to be suffer'd to be contradicted, and expos'd as base, false oft, or injurious, if not impious, in the place where it is vented against me.

Now, because there are a sort of Men that are always eloquent in doing private, if not publick Mischief from the Pulpit, I shall beg leave for a General, and I hope Sufficient answer to all such my Calumniators, to submit what I here write to the censure of my unbiass'd Christian Reader, nay, even of the Fathers of the Church, to whose Judgment, I dare own, I can Occasionally Conform, in relation,

at least, to the concealing my Opinions from the Publick, whatever my private Sentiments may be, as to the truth of my Assertions, in case an ill consequence in matters of Religion, do unavoidably follow from this my Notion : Provided nevertheless, that I be first convinc'd of such *real ill Consequences* on Religion, and that the reason why the Waters are troubled is, because I have made the Fountain impure.

But, if on the contrary it appear :

1. *That I have justified the Veracity or Truth of the Holy Scriptures against Philosophical Innovations and Traditions of Men.*

2. *That I have Vindicated the Justice and Honour of God, in His equal distribution of Rewards and Punishments.*

3. *That I have rightly stated and maintain'd one of the chief Articles of the Christian Faith, viz. The General Judgment of the last Day, against the necessary ill consequences of Platonic Doctrine, &c.*

4. *That I have done not the least injury to Religion or Christianity.*

(All which I presume will demonstratively appear hereby) what will my Accusers say then ? Why, truly Acknowledgment of a fault is so hard to be obtain'd, that 'tis odds but that they will obtrude some excuse or other, to justify, or at least to alleviate their Calumnies ; and I heartily wish they would

would own the right, that is, their *Ignorance in Comprehending*, or their *Confidence in Railing* against those Doctrines they are not able to confute; but instead of this, I expect these young Conjurers in Divinity, having rais'd a Devil they cannot lay, will run into greater Heats and Animosities; and as they heretofore have call'd me openly a *Broacher of Atheistical Opinions, Hobbist, &c.* So will they Stigmatize me with the Name of a *Madman*, or a *Fool*, I mean one of those Fools, *Who say in their Hearts there is no God.* These are the *Wanton Jessuruns* of Our Age, who *Kick and Spurn at All* that will not put on the same *Geers* (as I may say) as they do, that is, will not subscribe to the same *Opinions without Examination*, which *they Themselves* from the Principles of Education have imbib'd. But if they do this, and the popular Cry by these Men's instigations run against me, I thank God I can put on so much Christian Patience in Imitation and Obedience to my Great Master and Saviour, *Who when he was revil'd, revil'd not again*; as to sit down for the future easy under such Calumnies, and pals them over with as great evenness and sedateness of Mind, as you have by your example learn'd me.

But had you not, I value very little the popular Cry, especially when I endea-
 your

your after Truth, upon account of a Good
 Conscience, and Sincere Zeal for Christia-
 nity, which, I declare are the *only motives* of
 my so strenuously defending this Notion of
 the Soul. 'Twas popular Cry that stigma-
 tiz'd our Saviour with the Brand of an Im-
 postor, *That he cast out Devils by the Pow-
 er of Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils, Luke*
II. v. 15. And when *St. John the Baptist*
came neither Eating nor Drinking, they said
he had a Devil ; but when the Son of Man
came Eating and Drinking, behold a Man Glut-
tonous, and a Wine-bibber, Matth. xi. v. 18,
19. So that He that endeavours to please
 the Populace, excited and mis-inform'd by
 ill Priests, (as the *Priests* were at the bot-
 tom of that against our Saviour Himself,
 I don't in the last question) will but un-
 dertake a fruitless Labour, and can expect
 but little or no success. I know there are
 some Men in the World, that rather than
 play at no Game at all (as *Hugh Peters*
 said) will condescend to enter into an *Herd*
 of *Swine*, I mean, actuate the *Common Mob*
 of the Nation, rather than not have an hand
 in doing some mischief or other, in exciting
 the Civil Power, if possible, to set an edge to
 the Spiritual Sword, to the ruin of all their
 Gain-sayers——And be it so, I am well as-
 sured at the same time it must be highly in-
 discreet, and mistaken Zeal, and not regu-
 lated

lated according to the true Principles of Christianity ; so God forgive them——

As for your obliging Perſwaſions to induce me to take Holy Orders, ſince I am ſo delighted with the Scrutiny into Theological Doctrines, I thank you, but I hope it will be firſt neceſſary to clear my ſelf from thoſe many unjuſt, and ſcandalous Aſperſions of *Atheiſm*, &c. I have been charg'd with, before I aſſume ſo ſacred a Function, being conſcious to my ſelf that Men of ſuch Principles muſt have an Impudence above the power of Words to explain, that ſhall preſume to attend at the Altar, and enter into the Sanctuary of the moſt High God in order to ſcoff at, and deride Him, which He that is an *Atheiſt* I am ſure, cannot do otherwiſe. When I have juſtified my ſelf in the ſight of ſober, and good Chriſtians, as I preſume I ſhall do by the ſubſequent Argumentation, then you ſhall have my final Reſolution, as to thoſe Motives you propos'd on the abovemention'd Conſideration. But ſuppoſe I am in this point a *Diſſenter from the Church of England*, as I thank God I am, may not He that is angry with me for not being of the ſame Opinion He is of, be as juſtly angry with me for not being like Him in the Face? For Opinions are but certain Lineaments of the Mind, by which one Man ſeems internally
to

to be as much distinguish'd from another, as He is *externally* by the Features of the Face; Now what a ridiculous Cavil shou'd any Man enter on to justify a rational Grounds of Quarrel, by reason of the different Lineaments of either? When I am truly satisfied that the Church of *England* is so entirely *pure*, and *Holy* in all its Principles and Doctrines, that it needs no farther Reformation, then I will, as bound in Conscience, silently and patiently acquiesce with full *assent and consent* to all it teaches, as necessary to Salvation. But should I give myself leave to enter the Lists, and make a narrow Scrutiny into some Doctrines of the Church of *England* (not to speak of the Discipline thereof) I doubt They might easily be prov'd to as much unscriptural, as the Notion of *Immaterial Substance* appears to many wise Men, ridiculous. But at present I shall forbear any such Attempt, and confine myself only to what I at first design'd, *viz.* To represent, by way of Vindication of myself to the World, that these Principles I have built my Notion of the *Soul* on, are neither *Atheistical*, nor can in reason be construed to be in the least *Dest.uctive to Christianity*.

Now this Task I have undertaken in defence of myself, will perhaps, by some be thought impossible, especially those who by

Hear-

Hear-say only, and Misrepresentations from the Pulpit, have been taught to believe that my Notion of the *SOUL* subverts all Christianity, and turns Religion into *Atheism*. As I think this Task not only *possible*, but *easy*, so I cannot conceal from you that I think myself able to effect, at least to *shape* out a Way to effect a Thing of far greater Consequence to the Nation in General, and the Protestant Religion, which is to lay an *undeniable foundation of Uniting* two of our greatest Sects to the Church of England, upon very *feasible Terms*, built on the surest and firmest Basis now in the World, *viz. JOINT INTEREST*, so as to strengthen the Church of England (in my Opinion) as to put it beyond a possibility of being shaken, and at the same time by a small Concession of Interest to give support and Maintenance to most of the *Presbyterian Ministers of England*: Which if so done, and the Church not prejudic'd or injured thereby (as I conceive it will not) it will encourage *Both* with Boldness, to rebuke, and reprove, &c. all turbulent and factious Spirits that shall endeavour to molest such an Union, and heal in some measure our unhappy Breaches. For Amity built on *Joint-Interest and honest Principles*, I look upon to be a Link *inflexible in the Chain of Human Affairs*, and a Cement almost impossible to be broken, especially

pecially when *Dissenting Ministers* shall perceive the Difference between *demanding something of Right, and Petitioning a Congregation, for a Maintenance.*

I know it is look'd upon as impossible by most, that any true Foundation of Union between the Church of *England* and our Dissenters, can ever be found out; and, if we mean, to be in all points of Religion entirely *One Body* I readily consent. But if some method can be devis'd to make us shake Hands together, tho' *not to come into so close Embraces*, as cou'd be wish'd, I think the Impossibility of such a Project for *Comprehension* must be deny'd; I am sure, thus far it will be serviceable, that by the Dissenting Ministers being supported by a certain and legal Revenue, they will be so far Friends to Their Supporters, as continually to espouse That Cause on which Their Interest is dependant and maintain'd, by which the imaginary Danger of the Church will for ever be totally prevented. Altho', in my Opinion, I cannot see any true grounds, or foundation of Jealousie at present of any such pretended *Danger of the Church of England*, as some imagine. For if I mistake not, the very Constitution of our Government is upheld by two principal Props, viz. the Ecclesiastick, and the Civil Power. Now can any Rational Men suppose that the Poli-

Politicians of our Nation by overstretching, or too much aggrandizing any other Power, will endeavour to cut off one of the chief Props of the Government, in order to stand the firmer, or run the faster? Why should such an Attempt be thought reasonable, or advantagious, when as there is so necessary a Dependance of one upon another, unless we should imagine an whole Nation *voluntary* choosing Self-Ruin? It is not as yet out of the Memory of some Men, how the *State* fell to Ruin and immediate Destruction, when the Rights of the *Church* were invaded, and *Houses* of the *Lord* made *Denns of Thieves*, and *Plunderers*, not *Houses of Prayer*; therefore I desire those who imagine the Church to be in such eminent Danger, as They conceive, to weigh well the Reasons of such Fears and Suspicions, and then consider how inconsistent it is with the Body Politick to dismember it self of one of its greatest Supports, in order to make (as I may call it) an *Ecclesiastick Revolution*.

This I have added here only by way of Preface, as it were, or Introduction, because as by this my Vindication I not only aim at Peace and Amity, between those who are unreasonably angry with me upon Account of my Notions in Divinity, as *manus in alienam messem Immittentem*, so also to
show

show the World how ready I am, if occasion requir'd, to make an *Universal Harmony or Union of Minds*, if possible, between *Those* of the Church of *England*, and *Those* who upon ground of *other Notions* in Divinity sometimes are as much the Subject of Pulpit-raillery, as I have been, that, if possible, by mildness, and a true Christian Temper, firm Unanimity amongst differing Parties may be establish'd. How far some have on this Occasion let loose their Pens against me, besides others who have with more *Zeal than Knowledge* declaim'd against me from the Pulpit, I proceed in the first place to examine, and as far as I have observ'd, scarce one of them makes a right Judgment of the main Point in Debate. One asserting *for me*, That I argue for a *Soul-sleeping*; others, That I deny the *Immortality of the Soul*; others, That I aver it to be *material*, all which are mistaken Suggestions, and not at all to the purpose. For the Question is not

Whether the *Soul of Man* be *Immortal, Material*, or sleeps in the Grave after it is separated from the Body. But,

Whether the *Soul* be only a *Breath of Life*, or Power added to dead Matter, by which the same is quickned, or enlivn'd, as is declar'd by the Word of God, which cannot lye. *Gen. 2. 7.* Or,

Whe-

Whether it be a *Separate existing Spirit*, or *Immaterial Substance*, united to *Body*, as declared by *Socrates*, *Plato*, and other *Heathen Philosophers*?

Subsequent to these Questions, others, as *Secondary* ones, naturally follow, *viz.* What is meant by that *Breath of Life*, mention'd in the *Holy Scriptures*? Whether it be the *same* which *Philosophers* have call'd a *Spiritual*, or *Immaterial Substance*, or whether it be only a *Power* united to the *Body* equally common to *Men* and *Beasts*, by which *They live, move, and have their Being*, in this *World* under the *Providential* care of *God Almighty*, who, if *He taketh away That Breath*, *They dye, and return to Their Dust*, but if *He sendeth forth His Spirit*, *They are created, and He reneweth the Face of the Earth*, *Pf. 104. v. 29. 30. see Job 34. v. 14, 15.* These are the main Points in Question, and not whether the *Soul* be *Mortal*, or *Immortal*, *Material*, or *Immaterial*, *sleeps*, or not *sleeps* with the *Body* in the *Grave* until the *Resurrection*. All which *Opinions* have been some way or other charg'd on me, but unwarrantably, any more then as *They* may be deduc'd as necessarily consequential to the *Souls* being a *Power*, and not *Substance*, and that too in relation to its *Immortality* only.

Of Those who have principally, at least from the Press, misrepresented my Opinion, the First is the Learned Mr. L—y, who in his Preface to *Eusebius*, declares *it to have been an exploded Heresy* in the second, or beginning of the third Century, meaning thereby, as I humbly conceive, That my Opinion of the *Mortality, or sleeping of the Soul*, after Man dies, is an *Heresie* that was then *exploded*, and now again reviv'd by me. If this worthy Gentleman had seriously weigh'd, and consider'd my Opinion, that it is far different from what He imagines, I have reason to believe He would have chang'd His; especially if He had consulted *Second Thoughts*. Pag. 291. where the very same Matter of Fact is alluded to in express Words,— *St. Cyprian, in whose time* (says my Author) *there was an Heresie of those Men, who say the Souls of Men perish with the Body, condemn'd in an Arabian Council as Eusebius testifies about Anno Dom. 249.* (which I take to be the passage Mr. L—y alludes to) —And justly condemn'd too, seeing they all agreed as Plato had taught them, that the Soul of Man was a Spiritual Substance, united to the Body, which very Notion of Spirit implies in its own Nature Incorruptibility, therefore no wonder if almost all the Primitive Writers, being Platonists, such an Opinion should be condemn'd as Heretical. *vid. Pag.*

292. Now let but any one therefore consider the main Question in Debate before-mention'd, viz. Whether the *Soul* be a *Breath of Life*, or *Power*, &c. and I doubt not but that the Misrepresentation of my asserting the *Mortality of such a Soul*, He means, is a manifest violation of Truth, and deservedly to be blam'd—The same Error Mr. *Dodwell* seems to have embrac'd, *Præm.* p. 26. without reason also.

The Second I here take notice of, seems to be a kind of *Lurcher in Divinity*, who tumbles round and round very frequently in his way of Argumentation, either to amuse or surprize his uncautious Readers. Hence has he rais'd a great Dust with the Word *Immortality*, Oh! *the Immortality of the Soul* is endanger'd, if not totally subverted. This Word by frequent Repetition from the Pulpit is ador'd amongst the Populace, and for that Reason, as I suppose, he takes an advantage to mix himself with, or lead on the common Cry, in order, as the Prophet expresses it, *to hunt a Soul to Destruction*. That is, to ruin me, if possible, in all secular Concerns, by exciting popular Reproaches, and affixing ignominious, and unworthy Characters. Hence he is pleas'd to make a Jest on my Profession, for *having sent many Souls to Hell, or the Grave, &c.* The Observation I make

on all such Disputants is only this, *That Their Defect of Learning, and good Manners, is generally supply'd in those Cases by an over-stock of Ignorance and Confidence, and Their Business is, for want of the two first Qualifications, to rail a Man into a Confutation, if possible, by the assistance of the latter.* Had He pursued me as He ought to have done, in every Point, He would have found no reason to have raised this popular Dust, because *Pag. 185.* I say thus, *I deny not Immortality to Man after this Life, tho' I do to your Immaterial Substance;* and again. *If Life be an Essential Property flowing from an Immortal Spirit, it is impossible but that that must be immortal also.* *ibid.* Now the Mistake is easily to be discover'd. The Question is, what is meant by the Word *Soul*, whether an *Immaterial Substance*, which must be *immortal*, if it be so; or whether it be a *Power*, dependant on *Body* call'd *Breath of Life*? Instead of answering which Questions, He takes it for granted that *Second Thoughts, &c.* is nothing but a Book wrote to confound the *Immortality of the Soul.* All such who are led away with that popular Expression *Immortality of the Soul*, never to be found in the whole Bible, but frequent in the Books of Heathen Philosophers, take but this short Remark into Their serious Consideration, and then perhaps
Their

Their Prejudices may cool, and They be no longer terrify'd by noise, and popular clamour, as if the whole System of Christianity were at stake, *viz.*

If Man had not sinned, all Divines hold that He would not have been subject to Death, but *immortal*; now having forfeited that State by Eating the *Forbidden Fruit* He became *Mortal*, or liable to Death. And because neither the Patriarchs, or Prophets, *plainly* told Us, how that *Immortal State* was recoverable by Man, our Saviour by the preaching of His Gospel brought *Life, and Immortality to Light*, i. e. He inform'd us plainly of the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, at which time Man should regain his *Forfeited Immortality*, and, as the Angels of Heaven, live for ever, and are therefore call'd the *Children of the Resurrection*, by Luke 20, 36. the Evangelist: Now what a needless Rattle is there about denying the *Immortality of the Soul*? Is it not sufficient, that I assert upon the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, that Man *shall, and will be Immortal* after the Resurrection? Do's any Man require more than to go and live in Heaven for ever at the Day of Judgment, which is the determin'd time, when the Goats, and Sheep shall be separated? If any are eager to mount thither in Their Souls before God's prefix'd

time, as by his Will reveal'd in the Holy Scriptures; it so appears, let Him endeavour to become by a Godly and Virtuous Life, a *Favourite of Heaven*, as I have stated it *Pag. 315. of Second Thoughts*, and I doubt not but He may and will, as well as *Moses* was, be rais'd and exalted to Heaven before the General Resurrection. As for this Gentleman's rumbling out *Adæquate Rewards*, and *Adæquate Punishments*, about original Sin, I leave it, as I found it, *i. e.* an Argument not to the purpose.

Such another Jester as this is my unknown Antagonist Mr. Re——s, a Man of wonderful Curiosity and Learning indeed, tho' He is so unhappy frequently to deviate from common Sense, and good *English*, as doth appear in his Declamation preach'd before the Company of *Apothecaries*, September the 22d. 1704. on *Matt Ch. x. v. 28. Fear not Them that can kill the Body, &c.* I could wish (says He) that a certain Physician had not practiz'd upon this Text against the Soul. For He is not reflected upon, I dare say, as one of the the Killers of the Body; However, we are commanded not to fear Him, and, indeed, He is a very inoffensive Person in Argument. But I am in hopes, if He goes on in writing against the Soul in this manner, in a short time we shan't have one Infidel left. Tho' I wonder why that which made Galen a Believer, should make a-
ny

ny of his *Sons*, an *Atheist*. Our Saviour asserts the *Souls* of *Dives* and *Lazarus* to survive *Pag. 16.* — Again, in His Second Philosophic Declamation preach'd the Thirteenth of *September, 1705.* before the same Society, he by a side Wind puts them in mind of his former, lest it should slip out of Memory, by telling them, *That an Atheistical Professor of Physick, is of all Men most inexcusable.* Now give me leave to make use of his fine Rhetorical Embellishments of Speech, by which you will easily guess at the force of his Argumentation.

After he has nibbl'd a while at the Power of *God* to make matter *Think*, and looks upon it, tho' not in plain terms, that *God cannot make matter Think*, at least, that he has by his Argumentation, prov'd it impossible for Omnipotence to do, then come the Batteries of *no Reason, no Sense, and no Grammar* in several parts, rais'd directly against a certain Physician's Opinion of the *Soul*, who has (as he misconstrues it, or does not understand it) endeavour'd weakly to destroy its *Immortality*. Now I would fairly ask this Gentleman, whether he owns any more than one *Mediator Jesus Christ. 1 Tim. chap. 2. v. 5.* If no more, why he does not own but one Being, that is *God*, who *only hath Immortality*, or who *only is Immortal*; according to the Doctrine of the same Divine

Authority, as the former? It appears plain to me by this Text, that *God only in his own Nature is Immortal*, and nothing else; and that all Creatures else are so by His Divine Will and Power. Now, that the *Soul* is said to be *Immortal* either way, by the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, I think I may justly challenge Him, and all the World beside to prove; so that, if this were my case, he must be in the Wrong, or St. Paul, 1 Tim. 6. 16. But as the point of Controversy insisted on, is quite different in relation to what I propose, and He means, I am sure he must be abominably in the Wrong. And it so, according to elegance of his Style in his first Declamation, what an *Insurrection of Pens*, page 17. ought to be excited against that Preacher, who before a judicious Congregation, durst Preach (a flat Lye, some would say) so notorious an Untruth, and call our Saviour to justify it too, by saying, that our *Saviour asserts the Soul of Dives and Lazarus to survive*, when as our Saviour says not one Word of either of their Souls? How do's He put *Reason and Conscience under Contribution*, pag. 18. to enforce them, if possible, to Believe this His false Assertion? Nay, this Reverend Rhetorician unwarily defends that very Opinion He endeavours to confute, as thus: The Author of *Second Thoughts* makes it as one
Argu-

Argument against the unconceivable Notion of uniting a *Mortal*, with an *Immortal* Principle, *Pag.* 152. §. 75, and as it cannot be conceiv'd in Nature; its highly improbable, &c. see the place before cited. Now this Gentleman, my Adversary, backs it, because *Our wise, and Good God would not act as unnaturally as Mezentius coupling the Living to the Dead, That He would not join the Notion of Immortality to a Creature of its Nature Mortal, Pag.* 10. Great Wits I find have bad Memories; For what is this but an Argument on my side whom He hath stigmatiz'd as *Atheistical*, yet is pleas'd to concur with me in that very Opinion He has preach'd against. For it must mean so, or mean nothing— If He means that the Wisdom of God is such, as that it would not make a *Mortal* Principle [Body] *Immortal*, or it is such that it would make none but an *Immortal* Principle *Immortal* (either of which meaning I am sure, must be ridiculous, and foolish) in order for Their Union, of which Mankind might have some Rational Conception, or Idea, He talks not at all to the purpose. But just as if He had *Practis'd upon a Text*, and found in Himself a *Natural Enthusiasme*, (vid. the second Declamation, *pag.* 3. preach'd before the same Society) *Sept.* 13th. 1705. by which it was impossible for HIM to be an *Atheist*. For this

Enthu-

Enthusiasme is so plain, and evident in His way of Expressing Himself, that by it, He has discover'd *Heavenly Bodies* to have a *supernatural Gravitation*, pag. 3. which sort of *Gravitation* is very pretty indeed, if we could but comprehend it as well, as He speaks it: But, I doubt, his *Blood*, that *Red Sea of Man*, Pag. 9. is somewhat influenc'd by the Moon, when He breaks out into such Metaphorical Raptures as to tell us, that *Natural Causes are intrinsic with Apothecaries*, Pag. 17. which is admirable indeed, but They would have one perfection more, if They could do Business without *wearing out the Gloss of Life*, p. 12. This on my Word is no *Thread-bare* Argument (to comply a little with his Ingenious Elegancy) to prove what He aims at, but possibly may prove an undiscover'd World, that is, *A Moral World in Man*, pag. 13. tho' it was never yet heard of, nor can be proved by any other Man's Reasons, except *Reasons in the Pocket*, pag. 15. To which, if he will be pleas'd to add a little of the *fulsom Oil of Popular Commendation*, Pag. 15. perhaps they may go glibly down, and be swallow'd the easier, when He endeavours to impose on a wise Congregation. But as They are urg'd, I cannot tell how the World will receive them, or how His *Name will be perfum'd*, Pag. 16. since popular *Breath*

is

is but a *Fulsome Oil*: In short, all I can say at present, I doubt these odd Expressions declare his *Mind to be dissipated, and his Judgment Discolour'd*, Pag. 18. which unwonted Colour, I am afraid, the *Judgment* took for want of being *fomented with Consideration*, Pag. 22. the only Fomentation, beyond all Chyrurgical ones, that can clear the stains, and discover the *Nobility of the Soul*, Pag. 23. and imblazon it too on occasion.

How can any Man of Sense bear such Expressions without Ridicule? Or rather, how could any Man of pretended Learning dare adventure to expose them in Print, without appearing first in *Red and Yellow*, to let the World know what they must expect? Yet these Rhetorical Trifles raise Envy, and promote as much personal Mischief amongst the Vulgar, as the Man of the greatest Learning could do. So unfortunately happy are some Men to see all their intended Schemes of Malice, even without Sense and Reason carried on with success.

Another Writer of the same stamp almost, who has endeavour'd to traduce me to the World, is the Reverend Mr. Br—n, whom I have already answered, so shall only say here; That his Grand Error of fixing on a *middle state for the Souls* of the Deceas'd in this World, grounded on the Story, or Parable of *Dives and Lazarus*, has so shock'd
the

the rest of his Argumentation, that in the Opinion of most sober Men, even Divines themselves, the whole Fabrick seems to be but weakly erected, inasmuch as it asserts a Kind of a Purgatory (*For Dives being in torments, lift up his Eyes. Luke 16. 23.*) to be the Receptacle of Souls, without which Notion he could not have answered my Objections, or indeed have made any one of his own tolerably bear. Because, that *supposes* that *Substantial Distinction* between *Body and Soul*, which I require *Him*, and all Men to *prove*. Indeed, I am apt to think that this Ingenious Gentleman was put upon writing an Answer to *Second Thoughts*, and other more Learned Treatises, by some malicious pretended Friend, in order to expose him for an unsuccessful Attempt, as knowing that Treatise of *Second Thoughts* impossible to be satisfactorily answered by any Priest, Jesuit, Calvinist, or Person of any Sect whatever. Which has been very frequently and publickly said to my Face, by Men of great Learning and Ingenuity, tho', at the same time, they avowedly profess'd they durst not espouse it against the stream of Popular Clamour.

The last of my Antagonists, is the Reverend *Bombomachides*, Author of the 5th Conference with the Theist, with whom I must

must beg leave to be free, because he hath been so with me in his Conference; for as to his Arguments, I declare I cannot find above one that has so much as Plausibility to support him, all the rest centring in exciting the *Odium* of divers People and Parties against me, or by wordy *Amusements*, imposing on the ignorant and uncautious Reader, who adores the Word *Immortality*, without searching into the *Thing*, or Subject to which he applies it, viz. whether to Soul, as an *Immaterial Substance*, or a *Breath of Life*.

The first Charge without Argument, or Reason, to excite an *Odium* against me amongst many Learned and Judicious Persons, is drawn for the Place of my Education; That *Bradwardin*, *Occam*, *Wicliff*, were the Glories of *Merton College*, which is now blemish'd by the *Heterodoxy* of one Son. Pref. p. 7. Who by a terrible dereliction of the Divine Grace has fall'n into the most dangerous of Errors, the Denial of the Immortality of our precious Souls, p. 4. and lent an Arm to undermine a Branch of the Common Faith. p. 8. Now into what a terrible dereliction of Sense and Reason, is this Gentleman fall'n, as to make not only *Occam*, *Wickliffe*, &c. *Orthodox Men*, contrary to all the Historical Account of those Times, insomuch, that *John-a-Gaunt* was

was forc'd to be Protector of the latter against the Spiritual Sword of the Church for his suppos'd Heredoxxy, tho' true Doctrines most, and own'd afterwards, tho' I am so unhappy as in these our Times to have no such kind Protector, and Defender for being guilty of Truth.— *But also*, to tell the World, that the *Belief* of the *Soul's Immortality* is an *Article of Faith*, which never yet was found in any Creed whatever, nor receiv'd in the Primitive Church till about 100 Years after our Saviour's Death, (vid. *Dr. Hody's Treatise of the Resurrection of the same Body*) and then too with Doubts, Scruples, and Diffidence, by many of the Fathers of those early Days of the Church.

The next show of Argument without Reason is, that I must have *a stroke at the Ministerial Function*, and I look upon it to be more fashionable to whip the Parsons upon the Backs of Heathen Priests and Popish Fryars, Pag. 16. now what is this but a Spark from a true Incendiary to incense the whole Body of English Protestant Clergy against me, if possible, without Candour, or Christian Temper? When as the Reason of Popish Clergy espousing that Opinion of a *Separate existing Spirit* to make *Their Godliness Gain*, is manifestly quite different from that of the English Clergy, who cannot do it

to any Secular advantage: Nay, if *Bombomachides* had but read pag. 42. of *Second Thoughts*, He must have read positively the *Romish Church*, and no other can possibly be meant by it. But suppose I had a mind to have a *stroke at some Clergy-men*, do I any more than *par pari referre* strike at those who take the liberty to *strike at every Body* from the Pulpit? But from this Odious *Innuendo* I pass over to another, wherein the Learned University of *Oxford* is said to be reflected on by me for their Decree, 1683. against the Principle of *Self-Preservation*, as if I shou'd charge them, *That to serve a Turn in a present Juncture of Affairs* (which Words are his, and not mine) they condemn'd that Principle of *Self-Preservation*, as *Antimonarchical*. Yet our *Wise Nation* of late have swallow'd down the *Belief of a Deity*, with less scruple than this *Doctrine*, pag. 23. Had you but added what follows, you had blunted the Edge of your Invidious representation, viz. *Not thinking it necessary to examine the Limitations*, which that Learned University did, of such an *advantagious Principle*, S. Th. p. 33. Indeed, Friend *Bombomachides*, this is not fair to represent half-sentences of mine, with an unwarrantable addition of your own, to blacken my Character and Reputation amongst those
 Learned

Learned Societies, where I had an Ingenuous Education.

Yet this is not all, next the whole Civil Power is to be excited against me. For those Words——*Yet our Wise Nation of late, &c. What a strange Expression is this? Say you, Do you think that we are grown to be a Nation of Atheists? pag. 36.* Now I think you have trac'd the matter as high as can be, and your *Gradual ascent of Calumnies*, as I may call it, from *Merton College* to the *Church of England*, from thence to the *University of Oxford*, and from thence to the *whole Nation*, will surely aggrandize your fame for that qualification, for being a *false Accuser of your Brethren*, in the Language of the Scripture; but in mine, to be no better than a *Superficial Calumniator*. But seeing you so reflect on me for an Expression, what think you of this, *God took advantage of Baalam*, to make him Bless the Children of *Israel*, whom he designed to Curse, *vid. The third part of the Conference with a Theist, pag. 49.* what would the Idolatrous Priest, as you style Him, have been *too hard, or too cunning* for God, if He had not *took the advantage of Him?* How will the Atheist be apt to Ridicule the Omnipotent Being, like to be baffled, as you intimate by one of *Baals Priests*; a crafty Fellow, indeed, if
God

God had not been pleased to *over-reach*, or *nick* Him (as our *English* phrase is) in the midst of his wicked Design. But to mitigate the Expression, and examine your Exposition on the Place; suppose we say for you, as you ought to have done, That God took occasion, or made use of that opportunity to convince Balaam, that the People of Israel were a Blessed People, yet it does not seem to me, that this Balaam was an *Idolatrous Priest*, as you call Him. For it is said, *Numb. 22. v. 8. I will bring you Word what the Lord shall speak to me*, and *v. 9. God came to Balaam*, *v. 10. Balaam said unto God*, *v. 12. God said unto Balaam*, and *v. 20. God came unto Balaam*. All which Expressions argue God Almighty's immediate Converse with the Prophet: Now would God contract such an immediate Converse, which looks like that to his Servant Abraham, with an *Idolater*, the greatest Abomination in the whole Scripture, which He abhorr'd and detested? Truly, I must beg leave to think this Reverend Bombomachides mistaken, and do rather believe, that Balaam was a Prophet of the Lord, absconding, or living privately amongst Idolaters, like those seven thousand in Israel, which had not bow'd the Knee to Baal, *1 Kings ch. 19. v. 18.* tho' they were unknown to *Elijah*. Of whom, when *Balak* the King of *Moab* had been inform'd,

after Trial, in all probability, of his own Priests first, He depended on Him for Success against *Israel*, by reason of his *immediate Converse* with the God of that Nation, to procure Him to be angry with *Jacob*, upon the account of *Balaam's* Sollicitation. For that which God hated in *Balaam*, was the *perverseness of His way*, v. 32. call'd, *The Error of Balaam for Reward* by *St. Jude* v. 11. His wicked Intentions to gain Riches by a flat Disobedience against God's positive Commands; for had He been an Idolater, in all probability, God would not have interpos'd to act for His People *Israel* by such an intimate converse; but have left them, as other Priests of the Heathens, to offer what foolish and despicable Sacrifices they pleas'd. All I shall say more in relation to those *Conferences with the Theist* that you have wrote, many of them with Superficial Learning, I must tell you, and can prove it, if I set about it; I wish you have not by your weak Reasoning in many Points, gave the Theist rather stronger Motives to adhere to their Opinion, than own a Conviction from your Confutation, which is far more injurious to Christianity, than my Opinion of the *Soul* can possibly be. As for this way of *playing the Incendiary*, it is a Common Shift, where Reason is weak, a meer prop to Superficial Argumentation, and Amusement of
Learn-

Learning. Now I pass on to examine your Answers to my Opinion of the Soul, as a *Spiritual Substance*.

Tho' you say *in the Infancy of the Greek Philosophy, that Tongue wanted Words to express a Spiritual Substance* by p. 43. I cannot guess your meaning, unless you mean *before the Greek Tongue was a Language*; for all the Learned World knows, that the *Greek Tongue* is, and ever was (for ought we know) so copious, so expressive of all Things possible to be express'd in any Language, that there never was, or is any like it. But alas! Mistaken Zeal, and Blunders in Learning, very frequently go together. The first Argument for this *Spiritual Substance* in Man, is, because there is something besides the Rational Soul, which performs the *Lower Operations*, as Concoction and Nutrition. For whilst I am talking to you, my Mind is taken up with *Philosophical Debates*, whilst my Blood Circulates, p. 50. Food Concocts in the Stomach, p. 51. Therefore, there is in Man, a Rational Governing Principle, and another which performs these under Offices. What does all this prove, any more than, that as some Animal Spirits are the Ground-work, or Basis of Thought in the Brain, so others promote Concoction in the Stomach, and Circulation in the Veins and Arteries? For I don't believe he will deny bare-fac'd, that God is

able to make Matter capable of Thought, notwithstanding all prepossessions of Philosophy, because He, or any others, are incapable of comprehending the *Modus* how Matter can exert Thought. 'Tis plain it *Lives*, yet unscrutable *How*; 'tis plain the Blood Circulates, yet almost impossible to comprehend the Origine, and continuation of its motion, unless we attribute it to God Almighty's first Creating of Man with such Powers, and then enabling him to communicate them by Generation to all future Posterity.

Nor doth it in the least prove his *Substantial* Form, tho' he says, pag. 53. *It cannot be deny'd that every Man has a Substantial Form, by which he is distinguish'd from every other Man, and from all other Creatures.* Indeed, I am so uncivil, as to deny it utterly, as knowing Men sufficiently distinguish'd by their *Accidental* Forms, and not by their Spiritual Substances, no more than a Man by *Life* is distinguish'd from another *Living Man*; 'tis the outward Shape, Figure, Talk, Gesture. &c. that constitutes this distinction. Well! *But the Soul must be a Substance, because it can be reduc'd to no Class of Accidents*, p. 62. Away with this Philosophick trifling, what is a Power implanted in Matter call'd *Breath of Life*, but an Accident, which all your Substantial Reasoning
can

can never prove absur'd, or incompetent with the Nature of Man, as to his Original Creation. You, indeed, cannot conjecture *Motion with Sensation*. p. 65. but I hope you may conceive them to be both *United in One Subject Matter*, else your Understanding is very weak ; As I am sure your Argumentation is so, when you infer, *that in Storms, Belfries and Explosion of Cannons, ibid, there ought to be most Soul, because most Motion is there*. Fie on it, would any Novice in Philosophy talk so ? What is become of the *Specific Distinction, Sensation*, conjoin'd with Motion ? Is there *Sensation* in Bells, Storms, Cannons ? Is not this a foolish and unphilosophical Conclusion, if a Beast be an Animal, *ergo*, The more Animality the more Beast without *irrationality*, which denotes Him Beast ? Yet that a Beast is an Animal, is undeniably true. So *If the Soul be Motion* (with *Sensation*, you should add) deriv'd from, and in the Seminal Matter of Adam, Then Adam must be a strange sort of a Monster to have all the *Vital Motion* in Him, which all the World have, p. 67. Put but the case in a Candle ; The first lighted Candle convey'd light to a second, that to a third, and so to millions of Candles, what a *Monstrous Candle* must that be to have all the light in it, which so many millions of Candles have ? O ! this wretched way of Ar-

gumentation beneath the dignity of a School-boy. Is it not plain to Sense and Reason, that every Original Cause may be continued in proper Subjects, if the Agents have powers sufficient, to ten thousand Millions of Millions of Individuals by propagation, without being said *to have all those future Causes and Effects in it self*? As for His Arguments that Brutes have no Reason; First because no one is certain thereof; and secondly, because they exert no Reflections, I look upon to be so trivial, that they are not fit to be answer'd, because *no Man can be certain of the Reason of a Babe, or one Born Deaf and Dumb, than He can be of a Setting Dog or Spaniel.* 'Tis plain to me, and so I believe to others, that Education and Conversation, especially by Speech, discovers the certainty of our Reason; and where these fail, as in Babes, 'tis manifest that can never be urg'd as an Argument, why they are not Rational, *Because one is not certain thereof.* As to the *Reflex Actions of Brutes*, I desire my Reader but to consult *Second Thoughts*, pag. 146, &c. And, I presume He will no longer stagger in Opinion about this Philosophick nicety of Brutes, whether *They have a fresh Remembrance of an Action, in order to judge rightly of it, or not.* I am sure, if any Brutes can be taught any Thing, that very docility
to

to do Things over and over again, must prove Reflection. So much for his Philosophick Reasoning; now for the *sounding Brass* and *tinkling Cymbals* of Argumentation, drawn from the Holy Scriptures.

First, says He, pag. 69. the *Different Way of God's Creating Men and Brutes*, argues them to have *different Souls*, one Created by his *Breathing*, and the other by his *Saying*, Gen. 1. 20. This is as wretched an Argument as any of the former, besides it must be false too; For the different ways of doing a *Thing* never argues that *Thing* of a *different Nature*, if it bear the same Name, or common Appellation, and be meant to be the same Thing in General. As for example, a Fire is a Fire, if lighted by a Fire of Wood, or Burning Glats, undoubtedly, so the *Soul* of Man, or Beast created by God, must be in the same Nature a *Soul*, tho' created by *Breathing* or *Saying*, two Actions *metaphorically* only apply'd to God, as He Himself owns, pag. 72. Moreover, it is false another way; For even the *Souls* of Brutes were created, if we believe the Scriptures, by *Breathing*, as well as that of Man, as God himself expresses it, *behold I, ev'n I, do bring a flood of Waters upon the Earth to destroy all Flesh, wherein is the Breath of Life*, Gen. 6. v. 17. call'd Gen. 7. v. 4. Every *Living Substance*; and v. 21, 22, 23. fully explain'd

to be in Brutes, and all *Flesh dy'd that mov'd upon the Earth, both of Fowl, and of Cattle, and of Beasts, and every Creeping Thing that creepeth upon the Earth, and every Man. All in whose Nostrils was the Breath of Life, of all that was on the dry Land died. Every Living Substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the Ground, both Man, and Cattle, and the Creeping Things, and the Fowls of Heaven.* Now, that *Breath of Life* is equally apply'd to *Man and Brutes*, I think is beyond all possibility of being question'd. But whether my Friend be one of those, who cannot be *Conscious of a Fault*, pag. 78. and consequently will not be convinc'd of this *His Error*, I cannot tell; I leave *Him* to consider of it, who tells you in the next Place, that *there is no Fault*, but in the *Transgression of a Moral Law*, pag. 79. So that the Laws of the Land hang a Man oft *unjustly*, for bidding *Him stand on the Highway*, if the Man has no Money to be robb'd of, &c. In short, with *Him* every National Law grounded upon Things indifferent, must be *unjust*, because the *Transgression* against them is no *Moral Transgression*, but purely founded on the Reasons and Conveniencies of Government. All Men are but as Brutes in the hands of Power, but if they have Transgressed against that Power, then *jus oritur ex delicto* (says the Civilian) that very Offence

fence, makes them liable to Death, tho' not for an *Immoral Action*, as much as the Beasts that perish by the Hand of his Master.

But now *Bombomachides* sounds his Trumpet, like the Priests of Old, before the Walls of *Jericho*, designing, at one Blast, to overthrow all the Foundations of my Argumentation from Reason, or Religion. As, Thus——*Thought is without Body, viz. In God, Angels and Spirits. Ergo — Ergo, what say I: Therefore the Soul, by which we think, is not Material, or Body.*——To which I reply, *That I never thought it so, and therefore the Agumentation of the more Matter, the more Thought, &c. for 12 Leaves together is to no purpose, or, to answer you jocularly, not material to the Thing in Controversy. Indeed, you shrewdly agrue, when you say, The Soul is not Material, because disunited from the Body by little Causes, Pag. 99. Little Causes, or Great Causes, suppose They be Material Ones, are all one with Relation to Spirit, or if They destroy Life, Pag. 100. Did ever Man so skim the Surface of Things, to form out a solid Reply to sound Reasoning? What can you mean by Material Ones, but such Causes as will certainly produce their Effects: Which in other terms amounts to this: Causes that will certainly bring an Effect to pass,*
will

will certainly bring an Effect to pass, and must be therefore very *Material*. What Trappings of Words, and Pageantry of Reason is this? A Blow on the Head, or Prick of a Nerve, cannot be suppos'd to drive out of the *Body* so noble a *Spirit*, as the *Soul* is call'd, meaning it to be a *Separate Existing Spiritual Substance*. This Argument I urge pag. 93. as Rational to conceive very improbable, by reason of the littleness, and weakness of the Cause to produce so great an Effect—But, O! says, *Bombomachides*, 'tis a very material One, and that's sufficient—So I confess it is, but for no other Reason but because it produces its Effect, and so it would be, if an Ounce of Gunpowder should blow up St. *Paul's Church*, tho' it cannot rationally be suppos'd to effect it.

Other Arguments relating to the *Materiality*, or *Mortality* of the *Soul*, as he urges them against me, so may I urge them against him, to as much purpose; only he that loves to be esteem'd a Disputant, loves to say something, tho' not to any purpose, least the World should think him silenc'd by force of his Adversary's Argumentation: So, for the future, let *Material Soul*, and *Mortal Soul* alone, if we discourse about its *Substantiality*. I am glad to find that you must own some kind of *Thoughts*, or *perception* [of pain,

pain, and pleasure] in *Brutes*, Pag. 159. Then say I, They have those *Immortal Substances*, call'd *Souls*— So They have (say you) *but very different from the Souls of Men*. For Brutal Souls *serve only for Salt to keep Their Flesh sweet the little time They live*, P. 164. Hah! Hah! Hah! ought to be a sufficient Answer to such an Argument. One would believe your *Soul* did not *Think* when you wrote This, tho' you assert, that *it always Thinks*, p. 165. Pray, how long do some Men out-live a Crow or a Stag, (as Naturalists observe) both of which are said to live 300 Years? Is this *a little Time!* or are their *Bodies* impregnated with this *Salt of Souls*? Or are you sure *Men's Souls* serve not for the same *Saline preservative*? Fie, I am asham'd of this idle Argumentation, which you but little amend in your sublime Conceptions of an *Angel passing from Earth to Heaven*, or *Vice Versa*, *without conceiving Him to pass thro' the Medium, or Air*, pag. 171. I must confess, I think such a Conception above the power of a Finite Understanding, but you are *infinite wise*, and so perhaps you may do, what others judge impossible. As to your Wisdom it is eminently conspicuous several Ways, As —

1. That the Word *Soul* signifying *Life* in Scripture, *is no argument for its Materiality*, p. 177. Nor do I aver, or attempt to prove

prove it——But you have this knotty Question, *How can Sin be ascribed to the Soul*, as it is *Micha 6. 7. If Life and Soul be the same Thing?* p. 181. Very easily, say I, for I takethis to be good Sense, and true *English. A Sinful Life*, I repent of the *Sins of my Life* past, *vid. Pool Synopsis* on the place. That the Word *Nepheesh* in *Hebrew* signifies *Self*, and also *Person*, and *Dead Body*, p. 184. *Ergo*, it signifies a *Distinct Soul from Body*, is such a wide Inference, that I cannot comprehend it; so I pass it by, and consider your nice Distinction of *Spiritually Mortal*, and *Physically Mortal*, p. 195. The *first Death* is incident to a *Spirit*, the *second* to *Living Mortal Creatures*. What you mean by *Spiritually Mortal*, I guess, but cannot say I *Know*: For it seems to me to be absurd in Terms, as being a distinction of your own Coyning, the Word *Spirit* having never before been in any Language that I have heard or read, *adulterated* with that Epithite *Mortal*. You tell us, indeed, you mean an *Exclusion from the presence of God*, and a *Being subject to his Eternal Wrath*, but did ever any one before you call this the *Mortality of a Spirit*; it has been oft called in Scripture an *Eternal Death*, in as much as a *Reprobate Sinner*, being *Dead in Sin*, and forc'd to Live in *Eternity of Punishments*, and this is only so *figuratively* too, but

but *Mortality* implies in it a *Dissolution* of the *Continuum*, or some United parts of a Substance, upon which it will be depriv'd of that present Existence it had. Now if you say this of the *Soul of Man*, 'tis, I am sure what you would not say, and if you apply it to the *Soul*, as a *Spirit*, I cannot forbear telling you that it is neither good Sense, or true *English* (for *Mortal* is a Word peculiar to Bodies, and not to Spirits) because the Words wou'd run thus; *The Immortal Spirit of a Man is Spiritually Mortal, i. e. Not Mortal* at all. Again, turn the Prospective, what become of the *Souls* of Good Men? Truly they must be *Spiritually Immortal*, those verbal Amusements to evade the force of an Argument.

2. Now for the last strong hold, which is in reference to the *General Judgment*, and ought here to be consider'd; but seeing I must necessarily handle the same, when I come to state in short the *whole Basis* or *Ground-work* of my Opinion, I'll supersede it, at present, only with this Remark, That our worthy Author of the *fifth Conference*, seems to infer a *General Judgment* only necessary to discover *Hippocrites*, That Men, who have been, in this World, deceiv'd by their outward form of Godliness, seeing the secret of *Wickedness* of their Heart display'd, that they do deserve the Punishment which is allotted them, p. 211. What Authority He has from Scrip-
true,

ture, to justify this his Doctrine of *one sort of Sinners* to be judg'd, and *not All* at the General Judgment, let the searcher of All Hearts judge to whom the Facts and Deeds of All Hypocrites, are as apparent as the Sun at Noon-day to Us, and I presume God might as well answer for his Justice in a *Particular Judgment every Minute* (if any such was) of those Men, as He can in a *General Judgment*, which our worthy Author thinks appointed that He may appeal to all the World to vindicate his Justice against *such Men only*.

What related to the Historical part of *Second Thoughts concerning the Soul*, He frankly owns, *That were it all True, would go a great Way to destroy the Doctrine of the Immortality of it*, p. 219. which this poor Gentleman endeavours so *awkwardly* to confute, as the like was never scarce (I believe) done; For when I endeavour to prove it, *an Heathenish Opinion establish'd in the Church, by means of the Platonic Philosophy* (tho' it is evidently plain, that it came *Originally* from the *Ægyptians* to the *Platonists*) which was in vogue about 360 years before Christ; He to confute me, derives it from *Homer*, an *Heathen Poet*, about 948 years before Christ. So that if *Antiquity* be an Argument for the Opinion, being of an *Heathenish Invention*, He has added to the force of mine, in order to confute me. Had he but consulted other pieces relating to this subject,

He

He might have been taught (as, indeed, God knows, he much wants Instruction) that the Doctrine, or *Notion of the Souls being a separate existing Spirit*, was a Doctrine of most *Heathen Nations* above 200 years before *Moses* was born, or the Scriptures wrote, tho' they were wrote 500 years before *Homer*. So that if you cannot plead one Antiquity from the Holy Scriptures, as the Original of this Doctrine, and the truth of it also; it signifies nothing, to Magisterially tell the World, pag. 222. *It is impossible that a Tradition should be so Universally Uniform, unless it had its Original from the Universal Dictate of Humane Nature*; because you cannot but know, that *Idolatry* was more *Universally Uniform* (as you call it) than any one Opinion in the Heathen World; nay, is to this day also, amongst Great and Populous Nations, and will you therefore call it the *Universal Dictate of Nature*, and true too? To conclude all, I give you this Caution, that if ever you write of any Controversial Point in Philosophy or Divinity any more, argue closely, and home to the purpose, without affectation to popularity, in order to excite a Party by *Odious Innuendoes* against your Adversaries, to back your superficial Argumentation. For although those of your own Opinion may like the Cause, and think it ought to be defended

Contra Mundum, yet they will quickly turn their Thoughts of an *ill defended Opinion* into secret Scorn, and Contempt of the Person who endeavour'd its defence ; so, for the future, never write, as you have here lately done, near 250 Pages on one Subject without a *plausible Reason* in many, and without one *solid Argument* in Any, in order to a Confutation.

Thus have I travers'd this Opinion, as canvas'd, and impugn'd by *Egregious Potent Adversaries*, which I never design'd to have intermedl'd with more, had I not such unchristian Provocations to excite me. That

— *Si Marmoreus vel Abeus essem,*

Even contrary to my own Inclinations I am forc'd *Labra movere*, (as the Poet says) to let the World know that what I have wrote deserves neither the Imputation of *Irreligion*, or *Atheism*. Neither had I now troubled my Self, or the World, with the recital of any Arguments from the aforementioned Writers, did I not find, that 'tis the Opinion of many, that they have *totally* and *utterly* prov'd my Notion of *Soul* to be vain, and erroneous. When as if a narrow Scrutiny be made into their Reasons, as here faithfully represented, I doubt the contrary doth, and will appear ; so *weakly*, so *trivially*,
have

have these Advocates of the Cause for the *Spiritual Substantiality of the Soul* talk'd, and impos'd upon Mankind, by the help of an Invidious representation of Things, or popular Clamour. Therefore to obviate for the future all such underhand, and unreasonable Dealings, I will state the whole Matter in Controversy briefly, and leave my Reader to judge whether the Notion of the *Soul*, I have defin'd from the Doctrines of the Holy Scripture, be not more consonant to Reason and Truth, than any formerly broach'd from Philosophy. Now in order to effect upon solid Grounds of Divinity what I pretend, I will endeavour to prove from undeniable Testimony the truth of those four Propositions mention'd *Pag. 6.* of this Letter. Whereof the

1. Proposition is this,

That I have justified the Veracity, or Truth of the Holy Scriptures, against Philosophical Innovations and Traditions of Men.

The best Proof I can have of this Proposition, is from the Testimony of those Texts in Holy Scripture, which relate hereunto, wherein *Breath of Life*, or *Life* (as being a *Power* added to Dead Matter, by which it is quickn'd and enliven'd into an *Animal*, or *Living Creature*) is plainly de-

clar'd to be *the Soul*, and that by the same Divine Authority nothing else *can*, or *ought* to be esteem'd the *Soul* in Men or Brutes.

The first Confirmation of this Truth appears from the Creation of Man, *Gen. 2. ch. v. 7. And the Lord God form'd Man of the Dust of the Ground, and Breathed into his Nostrils the Breath of Life, and Man became a Living Soul, or Substance, ch. 7. v. 23.*

Now one would think it almost impossible, out of so a plain a Text as this for any Man to devise a *Spiritual*, or *Immaterial Substance*, to be the *Soul* of any Living Creature. For why should *Breath of Life* be call'd *Spiritual Substance*? It is plain, and evident from Scripture, that *Adam*, the first Man created in the World, had no more than *Breath of Life* added to that Matter which was taken out of the Dust, and shap'd into Man, how then can it be possible, that any one born after him, can have a *Soul* different from the First Created Man? I wonder in my Heart what Satanic Illusion has possess'd Mankind, to believe any Living Creature compos'd of a Living and Dead Substance, against so plain, and self-evident a Text, wherein *Breath of Life* must only denote a *Power* superadded to the insensible Lump of Earth form'd into Man, or Brute; the next Living Created Being to be

be consider'd, according to the Scriptural, and not Philosophical Account of his Nature.

That God Almighty did likewise confer on Brutes that *Breath of Life*, as well as to Man, tho' it is not so evidently expressed in the Mosaic Account of the Creation of the World, is very manifestly deduc'd from other Texts in the Holy Scriptures: As Gen. i. 30. *To every Beast of the Earth, and to every Fowl of the Air, and to every Thing that creepeth upon the Earth, wherein there is Life, or the Breath of the Spirit of Life*, as in the Old Translation, I have given green Herb for Meat: And again, when Moses describes the Deluge in the Days of Noah, he recites it in the Language of God himself, tho' now disbeliev'd to gratifie Philosophical Curiosities, *Behold I, even I, (says God) do bring a Flood of Waters upon the Earth, to Destroy all Flesh wherein is the Breath of Life from under Heaven, and every Thing that is in the Earth shall dye.* Gen. 6. v. 17. Which is fully explain'd in the following Chapter, *Every Living Substance that I have made will I destroy from of the Face of the Earth.* Gen. 7. v. 4. Then in some following Verses He tells you what those *Living Substances* are: *In the self-same Day Entred Noah, Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the Sons of Noah, and Noah's Wife, and the three Wives of his Sons*

with them, into the Ark. ch. 7. v. 13. They,
and every Beast after his Kind, and all the
Cattle after their Kind, and every Thing that
creepeth upon the Earth after his Kind, eve-
ry Fowl after his Kind, every Bird of every
sort. v. 14. And They went in unto Noah into
the Ark, Two and Two of all Flesh, wherein is
the Breath of Life. v. 15. And they went
in Male and Female of all Flesh. v. 16. So
after this when the Deluge came, and co-
vered the Face of the Earth, He recites par-
ticularly the same Living Creatures, who
were not receiv'd into the Ark to have been
destroy'd v. 21. Farther explaining it v. 22.
All in whose Nostrils was the Breath of Life,
or the Breath of the Spirit of Life, as it is
in the Hebrew Text, of all that was on the
Dry Land, died. And every Living Substance
was destroy'd, which was upon the Face of the
Ground. v. 23. So again, when They were
enumerated to be created, God said, Let
the Waters bring forth abundantly the Moving
Creature that hath Life or Soul, as the He-
brew Text expresses it, Gen. 1. v. 20. Pa-
rallel to these Texts is that of Job, All the
while my Breath is in me, and the Spirit of
God, the Breath which God gave me, says the
Hebrew Text, is in my Nostrils. ch. 27. v. 3. so
again says Isaiah, Thus saith God the Lord—
He that giveth Breath unto the People upon
the Earth, and Spirit to Them that walk
therein.

therein. ch. 42. v. 5. From all which Texts of the Holy Scripture I make this general Conclusion, That from Their Authority it is impossible the Soul should signify any more than Breath of Life, or Life, if the sacred Scriptures be true, and that those must be very Ill Men, who endeavour to abuse the Christian World with any other Notion.

Among these, are principally *Pythagoras*, *Socrates*, and *Plato*, all ancient *Heathen* Philosophers, who by their Doctrines have so much impos'd upon the World, (strongly imbib'd Principles of Education) that they seem to be so riveted in our very Nature, that in spite of so great Conviction from the Authorities of Holy Writ above-mention'd, we are resolv'd still to bid defiance to the Authority of *Moses*, rather than disbelieve our Philosophers; as if we had resolv'd to make good the prophetic unhappiness of those Times *St. Paul* speaks of, to be fond of *believing a Lye*, and *being led away with strong Delusions.* 2 Thess ch. 2. v. 11. contrary to the Word of God, common Reason, and good Conscience, I wish I could not say that those Men, who promote such Opinions, not warranted by, but *contrary* to the express Word of God, do justly deserve the same Character the Apostle mentions of *Antichrist* in the same Chapter; That

is of imposing on Mankind by the working of Satan v. 9. in all deceivableness of unrighteousness, because They love not the Truth. That these strong Delusions, which God hath sent them, or they have voluntarily embrac'd, be not a means, that many be damn'd for not believing the Truth, but having pleasure in unrighteousness. v. 12. I am sure, if this be an Offence, requisite to be rooted out of the Doctrines of Christianity (as I humbly presume, I have sufficiently prov'd any other Notion of the Soul than what I have before recited, to be contrary to Divine Testimony) *Wo be to Us, if by Our teaching such Things, such Delusions, this Offence come.* But because it will be requisite to compare the Opinions of *Heathen* Philosophers, with that which I have here recited from the Holy Scriptures above-mention'd, I will give you an Account of Those, by whose Writings principally I conceive the Doctrines of our holy Religion are corrupted and *debas'd*, that is, *Pythagoras*, and *Plato*, both Eminent *Heathen* Philosophers; the first of which was born about 577 Years, and the second about 366 Years before our Saviour, as appears by *Helvicus's* Chronology. For as to *Socrates*, who was the third Philosopher, I mention'd before, I shall comprize his Doctrines amongst the *Platonists* of the same Age, inasmuch as *Plato* himself teaches us the same Doctrines,

Doctrines, and very little more than what his Master Socrates had learn'd him.

The chief Doctrines of Pythagoras are these.

1st. He acknowledged the Sun, Moon, and Stars to be Gods, as did the *Chaldeans*.

2^{dly}. That all things live in much as they participate of Heat, but all Things have not a *Soul*; the *Soul* is a Portion of *Æther*, of Hot and Cold, it participates most of Cold *Æther*. The *Soul* differeth from *Life*, She is Immortal, because that from which She is taken is Immortal.

3^{dly}. The *Soul* is a *Self moving Number*, call'd the *Mind*.

4^{thly}. The *Soul* of all living Creatures are Rational, but they act not according to Reason, because of the ill temperament of the Body, or want of Speech, as Apes, Dogs, λαλῶσιν ἔφραζουσιν *Talk and cannot Speak*. Bad *Souls* turn into Demons.

5^{thly}. The Beginning of the *Soul* is from the Brain, that part which is in the Heart is θυμός but φρένες and νῆς are in the Brain. The Senses are Distillations from these, the *Rational Part* is Immortal, the rest Mortal.

The *Soul* is nourished by the Blood, and the rest of the Faculties are Spirits. Both the *Soul* and her Faculties are Invisible, for *Æther* is Invisible.

6thly. That the Air is full of *Souls*, which are esteem'd Demons and Heroes, who require Expiations and Avernuncations.

7thly. That the *Soul* passeth after Death from one Body into another; are Pre-existent to the Body, and an Innumerable Company. Those which Pre-exist and Transgress, are sent down into the Bodies, so as being purified by such Discipline, they may return unto their own place; [a perfect Notion of the *Chaldaick* Philosophy] But those which, whilst they were in Bodies, lead a Wicked Life, are sent down into *Irrational Creatures*, thereby to receive Punishment, and right Expiation. The Angry and Malicious into Serpents, the Ravenous into Wolves, the Audacious into Lions, the Crafty into Foxes, &c.

8thly. The *Soul* hath a twofold Life, *Separate, and in the Body*; her Faculties are otherwise in *Anima*, and otherwise in *Animali*.

9thly.

9thly. The *Soul* is Incorruptible, for when it goes out of the Body it goes into the Soul of the World, which is of the same Kind; when she goeth out upon the Earth, she walketh in the Air like a Body.—*Vid. vit. Pythag. Part 9. of his Philosophy.*

10thly. After God had created the World (says *Timæus the Locrian*, and one of *Pythagoras's* Disciples) he proceeded to the Production of all mortal Creatures, that it might be perfectly wrought and compleated according to its Pattern. Having contemplated and distributed the *Soul* of Man by the same Proportions and Powers, he deliver'd over to that Nature which had the Power of Changing, she succeeding him in the mortal transitory Creatures, *instilled their Souls from the Moon*, some from the other Stars which wander in the Region of Alterity, excepting but one *Soul* in the Power of Identity, which he mingled in the Rational Part, or Image of Wisdom, to those who make use of good Fate. For of the *Human Soul* one part is *Rational and Intellectual*, the other *Irrational and Foolish*. As for the Body, the Principle and Root of Marrow is in the Brain, wherein is the *Hegemonick* of the *Soul*. *Vid. Stanley's Lives. pag. 421.*

11thly.

11thly. If when Man hath put off his Body, he remaineth burdened with Vices, then begins he to be truly miserable ; This Misery after Death, *Pythagoras* divides into two Kinds. The Unhappy are either near *Beatitude*, which tho' they enjoy not at present yet are not oppressed with extream Misery, being hereafter to be delivered from Punishment : Or wholly distant from *Beatitude*, in infinite, endless Pains. Thus there are two Mansions in the *Inferi* or Hell, *Elizium* or *Tartarum* ; the first, for those who are to ascend into Blessedness ; the second, for those who are to endure Torments *ὅθεν ἔποτε οὐ καίνοσιν* (says *Plato*) from whence they never ascend ; but when a Man that has lived justly, dieth, his Soul ascendeth to the purest *Æther*, and lives in the happy Regions with the Blessed, as a God with the Gods.

In the next place I will recite you the Doctrines of *Socrates* and *Plato*.

1. *Socrates* own'd and taught one God, and no more ; the Universal Intellect ; Matter the Subject of Generation and Corruption ; Idea, an Incorporeal Substance, the intellect of God, and God the Intellect of the World.

2dly.

2dly. That God takes care of his Creatures, and will reward such as please him, and punish such as displease him.

3dly. That the *Soul of Man* is *Immortal*; For *what is always moveable [or in Motion]* is *Immortal*, but that which moveth another, or is moved by another, hath occasion of Motion and Life, *vid. Stanley in vita Socrat.*

4thly. The *Soul* is pre-existent to the Body, endowed with *Knowledge* of *Eternal Ideas*, which in her Union with the Body she looseth, as stupified; until awakened by Discourse from sensible Objects. Thus all her Learning is a *Reminiscence*, a recovery of first Knowledge.

5thly. The Body being compounded is dissolvable by Death; The *Soul* being simple passeth into another Life, incapable of Corruption.

6thly. The *Souls* of Men are Divine, to whom, when they go out of the Body, the way to Heaven is open, as *Thales* and *Pythagoras* taught before him.

7thly.

7thly. *The Souls of the Good after Death are in an happy Estate, united to God in a Blessed inaccessible Place ; the Bad in convenient Places suffer condign Punishment.* But to define what those Places are, is *Hominis vbi non exoptat*, the Business of a Man that has no Soul or Mind at all. Whence being demanded what things were in the other World, he answer'd, *Neither was I ever there, or did I speak with any that came from thence.*

8thly. A Just and an Happy Man are the same, but the *Prosperity of the Wicked is most grievous to the Good.*

9thly. Being ask'd what was *Strength*, he answer'd, *The Motion of the Soul with the Body.*

10thly. He held *Death to resemble Absolute Annihilation of the Soul and Body*, making us insensible of Pain and Pleasure, and consequently not Evil. *vid. Vit. Socrat. pag. 80. Stanley.*

To these I shall add briefly the *Opinions of Plato*, his Scholar, which are,

1. *Cogitation* is the *Souls Discourse* with it self, and *Sense* is a *Passion of the Soul* by the

the mediation of the Body, and *simple Knowledge* (call'd *Reminiscence*) the *Wing of the Soul*, St. pag. 181.

2dly. God made the World *one*, as his Idea is one uncapable of Sickness or Age, and endow'd it with two parts, a *Soul* and a *Body*, this visible and corruptible, that is neither subject to Sight or Touch. The *Soul of the World*, which was from all Eternity, was not made by God, but only adorn'd by him, in which respect he is sometimes said to have made it, p. 187.

3dly. As God is the Maker of the World, so is he of Demons, which we may call *Intelligent Living Creatures*, and Gods endow'd with a Sphærical Figure [meaning the Planets] and this Universe by the Divine Will shall not be dissolved.

4thly. The Generation of *Volatile, Aquatile and Terrestrial* Creatures God committed to his Son, least if he himself had begotten them, they should also have been Immortal. The Maker of all things sent down himself their Souls (*i. e. Mens Souls*) into the Earth, equal in number to the Stars, and having imposed each one his proper Star, as a *Ve-hiculum*, he endow'd their Souls with mortal Affections.

5thly.

5thly. The Gods first form'd Man of Earth, and gave Him a *Soul* as Mistress of his Body, and placed it in his Brain or Head.

6thly. The Gods, the Makers of mortal Creatures, having received from the first God the *Soul of Man Immortal*, added unto it, two mortal Parts, and seated that *Soul* in the Head; the rest of the Body they appointed as a *Vehiculum* to serve the Head, the mortal Parts are the Irascible and Concupiscible Parts of the Soul, p. 190.

7thly. *The Soul of Man is Immortal. A Substance having within it self a Power to move it self and other things.*

8thly. The Motions of the *Soul* are these, *To Will, to Consider, to take Care, to Consult, to Judge, to Joy, to Fear, to Hate, to Love, &c.* These bring on the second Corporeal Motions, viz. *Augmentation, Diminution, Denfation, Rarefaction, &c.* Stan. pag. 7.

9thly. *Death is nothing but a Separation of the Soul from the Body.* vid. Phædon. Parag. 8th.

10thly.

10thly. Truly, did I not believe, (says Socrates in *Phædone*, parag. 7.) I should go to the Just Gods, and to Men better than any living, I were not excusable for contemning Death; but you may be certain that I shall go to the Gods, and hope to meet with good Men, wherefore I am not at all troubled at my Death, because I hope something of Man subsists after Death. The Greek Phrase is *ἐνελπίς εἰμι εἰ τι τοῖς τετελευηκόσι*, I am in good hopes that something will exist to the Dead, or Deceas'd, and that that State is much better for the Good than the Bad.

11. All Things are produc'd out of Contraries (says Plato) therefore from Death doth necessarily follow Life, its contrary, or *αναζωόσκεσθαι*, *reviviscere* to be quickned, and brought to Life again, *vid. Phædon. parag. 14.* therefore the Soul lives after Death. — But the main Proof of the Existence of the Soul is from the necessary Succession of Generation and Corruption, from its manner of Reasoning, being only Reminiscence, and consequently as it pre-existed, it will subsist after Death.

12. *Ἐι μὲν τὸ Ἀθάνατον, &c.* If that which is Immortal cannot die, then it is impossible that the Soul should perish or die. For it can no more receive Death, [it being a Principle
by

by him unquestionable, that *the Soul is the Fountain of Life*] than a Number Three be Even, or an Even Number be Odd, or Fire grow cold. *vid. Phæd.*

13. *The Soul which is an invifible Thing, goes [after Death] into like Pure, Excellent and invifible Place, hid from our Eyes, ἀντιπαρθεὶς ἁγαθὸν καὶ φρονιμὸν Θεόν, To the Good and Wise God, whether my Soul alfo, if God pleafes, will pafs fhortly. Phæd. par. 21.* Again, I believe (fays Socrates) *That God, and the very Image of Life, are the only things that muft be confefs'd to be Immortal and indiffolvable. Furthermore, if Death were a Diffolution of the whole Man, the Wicked would be gainers by it, feeing they would be freed from their Wickednefs and Soul together. But now, feeing the Soul is Immortal, they will have no efcape from Evil, nor will they gain Salvation, but by being very good and prudent. For the Soul when it paffes to the Ghosts below, carries with it nothing but Learning and good Education, which in the very Beginning of it, paffing out of the Body of the Deceas'd, is faid to be Profitable or Pernicious to him. And they fay furthermore, That the Souls will be carried to thofe refpective places, by Angels or Demons, who attended Mankind, when living. And if an Impure Soul mix and herd it felf with the Pure, they all fhun her Company,*

pany of the Gods and Heroes. *par. 41. in Phædon.* Again, they that have liv'd Godly in this Life, ascend on high, as freed from Earthly Prisons; as do also they that are purified by Philosophy, the Beauty of which places is not easie to be expressed, nor have I time to declare. Then we ought (says *Plato* in the Person of *Socrates*) all to endeavour after Virtue, Prudence and Wisdom in this Life, because there is a *Tartarum* or *Barathrum* [a deep Pit or Hell] *Parag. 44.* and an *Acheron* [a great River in Hell, so feign'd by the Poets] or *Acherusia*, Whither some of the Souls of the Dead are brought, and there remain for some space of Time; some a longer, others a shorter Duration, and then return into generated Animals again. But the Murderers in *Cocytus*, and the Disobedient to Parents in *Pyriphlegethon*, receive the End of their Wickedness.

It were endless for me to repeat the sayings of this Great Wise Man, and it is to me verily a prodigious Astonishment, to find such Notions in two Heathens, as *Socrates* and *Plato* were: Nevertheless it is hereby plainly evident, whence our Divinity of a Spiritual Substance of the Soul of Man took its Rise, and that all these Properties, Qualifications or Perfections, that the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and some of our lat-

ter Divines have attributed to the Soul of Man, are purely and meerly *Socratick* or *Platonick* Doctrines. For where has the Old or New Testament either given us any such *flourishing* Characters of the Soul of Man? Where are those *glorious Perfections* here ascribed to the Soul of Man owned by our Saviour, or any of the Holy Penmen in the Scripture? He promises indeed *Life Everlasting*, and *Happiness* to Good Men, [not mentioning the least Word of Soul] and threatens Ill Men with *Everlasting Damnation*, but where doth he say that our Souls shall be carried up into the *Pure Regions* of *Air*, or as the Language of the Divines is, into an *Heavenly Jerusalem*, &c. No, sure I am, all these are pure *Platonism*, and conjectural Dictates only of *Heathens*, who in this Point have undoubtedly Erred, as not knowing the Scriptures, nor rightly weighing the Power of an Omnipotent Being.

Altho' the Notions of these Great Philosophers be extraordinary good about the Soul's union with the Body, of its being of a Divine Nature, of the Punishments and Rewards to Good and Bad Souls after Death, of the Soul's Pre-existence and Immortality; yet we may plainly discover the Weakness of these Philosophers Arguments to prove the Existence of that Being, call'd Soul, on whom they are pleas'd to bestow so many glorious Endowments

dowments; and for whom they have invented such Noble Habitations of Bliss and Happiness; tho' *Socrates* owns, *he never was there, nor ever spake with any [Soul] that came thence*, meaning from those Habitations of Happiness; as he likewise owns *Death to resemble an Absolute Annihilation of Soul and Body*, which comes very near the undoing all he had endeavoured to prove before, relating to the *Immortality* of that *Spiritual Substance* he, and others had invented to be Idoliz'd by future Generations.

Thus have I stated the Opinion of *Moses*, and the Prophets, of *Pythagoras*, *Socrates* and *Plato*, 3 Heathen Philosophers, which bring the Question in debate into a narrow compass, viz. *Whether a Christian ought to Believe Moses and the Prophets, or those Three, and several other Heathen Philosophers?* This Question, tho' I put it now, and make it One, yet I am apt to believe by every Good Christian upon serious consideration, tho' with reluctancy of Education, perhaps the Authority of the Holy Scriptures will be preferr'd before That of the Philosophers, and consequently that I have made good my first Assertion, or Proposition, mention'd, pag. 6. *That I have justified the Veracity, or Truth of the Holy Scriptures, against Philosophical Innovations, and Traditions of Men*, wherefore I

now proceed to *prove* the second Assertion, or Proposition, there mention'd, *viz.*

Second Proposition.

That I have Vindicated the Justice, and Honour of God, in His equal Distribution of Rewards and Punishments.

Which I prove upon these Grounds. If the *Death of the Soul* be only *eternal Death* in Hell, why is the *Instrumental Cause*, *viz. the Body*, punish'd more for *sinning*, than the *Soul*, who escapes the first Death, and lives to the Resurrection? I cannot see how suitable this is to *Divine Justice*. For although we suppose both to suffer eternally, and consequently equal, there being *no degrees in Eternity*; yet give me leave to answer, that *Supposition* is altogether *Groundless*? For that *Eternity* a Man suffers in, is not strictly *Eternity*, but *Eviternity*, as the Philosophers call it; *i. e. such a duration of Time, as had a beginning, but never shall have end*. If so, it is plain here are *Degrees*, and may be admitted, and he that begins to suffer 5000 or 6000 Years before his Fellow-sinners, has a greater share than they can have, and consequently the *Balance of Almighty Justice* weighs not equal Things to Man-kind

kind, if one for the same Fault suffers so many Years before another; which far be it from any good Christian to question. Because it is directly to this Proposition of eternal Truth in Morality: *Eadem Pæna & non major indistincte omnibus ejusdem criminis usquequaque Reis infligi debet ut sit Justa nisi aliqua suggeratur causa quæ Delinquentem aliquomodo excuset aut premat; i. e.* The same Punishment, and no greater, ought to be equally inflicted upon everyone, that is in every Circumstance guilty of the same Crime, to denominate the said Punishment *JUST*, unless some cause be suggested to mitigate, or encrease the same.

The second Head I insist on, to *Vindicate* the Justice and Honour of God, &c. is God's prefix'd Time of a General Judgment, when He will bestow Rewards and Punishments, viz. at the *End of the World*, and not before. Our Saviour in his Parable of the Tares, tells us the prefix'd time when Mankind shall be call'd to Judgment, *Matt. 13. v. 30.* Let both the good Corn and Tares grow until the Harvest: And in the time of the Harvest I will say unto the Reapers, gather ye first the Tares, and bind them in Bundles to burn, but gather the Wheat into my Barn. Which Parable when he comes to explain, *v. 39.* The Harvest, says he, is the end of the World: The Reapers are the Angels, &c. And then shall the Righteous shine forth as the Sun in the King-

dom of his Father, v. 43. Now here is to me a plain Demonstration, that God Almighty will not begin his Judgment, or in the ordinary course of his Providence confer *Immortality on Man*; before the Resurrection, but permits the Just and the Unjust to lie in the Grave together until the Resurrection; at which time, and not before, shall be the Glorification of the Righteous; and then they shall shine as the Sun in the Firmament. For the Son of Man shall come in the Glory of his Father; and then shall he reward every Man according to his Works, Matt. 16. v. 27. And then shall appear the Sign of the Sun of Man in Heaven; and then shall all the Tribes of the Earth mourn: And they shall see the Sun of Man coming in the Clouds of Heaven with Power and great Glory. And he shall send his Angels with a great sound of a Trumpet, and they shall gather together his Elect from the four Winds, from one end of the Heaven to the other, Matt. 24. v. 30, 31. Here is the Pomp and Solemnity of the Great Day of Judgment prefix'd to judge the World in; and before that Day Man will not be prejudg'd or pre-rewarded, vid. Mark 13. v. 24, &c. and Luke 21. That is the time in which our Redemption draweth nigh. Again, Mat. 25. 31, 34, 37, 41. The Particle *Then* used, denotes the Time appointed

appointed by God Almighty, as much as it doth in any other place of Scripture.

Now whereas some explain this Parable only to mean, *That God intends to make no separation of the Just from the Unjust in this Life, because he has determined, That to be the business of the next World*, I cannot but in part approve of. For as God indeed makes no separation or distinction of the Just from the Unjust in this World, but lets his Sun shine promiscuously on Both. So will he make no separation of the one from the other until the prefixed time, viz. at the General Judgment, or Great Harvest. Thus far the meaning of the Text is very true, and the Explanation, Genuine and Good; but when a *Psychomuthist* brings his Principles explanatory of the same, he prefixes an *immediate separation of the Just from the Unjust at the very Point of Death*, and assigns their Souls to different states of Rewards and Punishments before the time of Harvest, the End of the World, and before the Reapers the Angels have commission to gather in either the Tares or Wheat. Now if this be not a presumptuous anticipation of God's peculiar Work, which he has reserved to Himself to do at the Day of Judgment, and not before, I leave all good Christians to judge. Let us therefore rest quiet, and sit down with this assurance, *That at the gene-*

ral Resurrection we shall all be raised in our former human Likeness, but our Flesh and Blood must put on Incorruption, and be spiritualized into such a Body, as will be capable of receiving those immense Joys, God has promised to the Righteous, or enduring those internal Torments he has denounced against the impenitent hardened Sinners. Thus far, I hope I have made good the Truth of my second Assertion, or General Proposition, in Relation to the Vindication of the Justice and Honour of God, and I therefore now proceed to prove the Third General Proposition, viz.

Third Proposition.

3. That I have rightly stated and maintain'd one of the Chief Articles of the Christian Faith, viz. The General Judgment at the last Day, against the necessary Ill Consequences of Platonic Doctrine.

Now, altho' what I have said in the Article above-mention'd, might be sufficient to any Christian Reader, yet because the Nature and End of the Resurrection in this Case ought to be stated and inquired into, to give Mankind a fuller satisfaction, if possible, of the Truth of my Doctrines I here publish to the World, therefore I will briefly consider Both. The Apostle arguing the Point of the Resurrection, 1 Cor. cap. 15. v. 25. says, Some Men will say, How are the dead raised, and
with

with what Body do they come ? not in the least intimating by How are the [Bodies of the] Dead raised up, as distinct from their Souls ; but he plainly means those dead Persons, who were once living Bodies ; because he says just after, with what Body do they come ? And indeed it would have been a very odd Question to have propounded, With what Bodies do the Bodies of Men (abstractly consider'd) rise at the Day of Resurrection, if the Word Body did not include the whole Man, when once he was a living Creature ? As if he should say, with what Body does Man rise at the Resurrection ? Because the Question seems to include Difficulty, both relating to the Shape, or exterior Figure, as well as proportion of Age, Vigour and Glory, &c. And indeed the Answer of St. Paul seems to illustrate it the better by saying, Thou Fool, that which thou sowest is not quickn'd, unless it die. As if he should have said, That which thou buriest in the Earth, even as Seed is buried, will never be reviv'd, or quickned again, unless it perish there ; no more will Man either. And this our Saviour delineates to us more fully, John 12. v. 24. Except a Corn of Wheat fall into the Ground and die, it abideth alone ; but if it die, it bringeth forth much Fruit ; which is just as to say, If whole Man dies (not his Body only) he will become the Fruit (after Christ the First-fruits)

fruits) of the Resurrection ; and *by losing his Life in this World*, as it follows in the very next Verse, *keep it unto Life eternal*. For if it were meant, the Resurrection of the *Body singly*, that cannot be called the Resurrection of *Man* ; for *Body singly is not Man*, and whatever will be reviv'd at the Resurrection, must die (*quickning as I said before, supposing a thing once dead restor'd to Life*) and consequently the *Soul* also must do so too, before it be raised again, if *St Paul's Doctrine* be true. In this Sense I take the Word *Body* in the *Apostles Creed*, meaning the Resurrection of *Man dead*, as it is in the *Nicene Creed*, the *Resurrection of the Dead*, and in the *Athanasian* more plainly, *all Men shall rise again* ; and so *Job* expresses it, *If a Man die, shall he live again ? Job cap. 14. v. 14, &c.* without all doubt, intimating the Resurrection of *Man totally*, as a living Creature as he once was : 'Tis then that *Person*, that was sown a *natural Body*, shall be raised a *spiritual Body* ; for there is a *natural Body*, and there is a *spiritual Body*, 1 Cor. 15. v. 44. where the Word *Body* does not infer a distinction from the *Soul*, but a Comprehension of the *natural Man*, viz. the first natural Man *Adam*, in contradistinction to the spiritual Man, *our Saviour*, or second *Adam*, who shall make us τὰς ψυχὰς ζῶσας, i. e. *Living Souls* in the Day of the Resurrection, and

and bear the *Heavenly Image* as we have born the *Earthly*, ver. 44. In the same Sense we find the Word *Body* at our Saviour's Crucifixion, when the Graves were open'd, and many *Bodies* of the Saints, which slept arofe, and came out of their Graves, and went into the Holy City, and appear'd unto many, *Matt. 27. ver. 52, 53.* Now no Man of Sense will interpret this to be the *Body only* reviv'd, and not the whole Man; or that they were only *Bodies without Souls*, that appeared unto many, unless they will feign a place where the Souls so reviv'd, and then re-united, were kept during the Corruption of the Body, and then summon'd by the Power of our Saviour, who was God and Man, to reassume their earthly Tabernacles, and ascend into Heaven: Which Fiction of a *Repository of Souls*, I think I have already prov'd as improbable as ridiculous. This Body doth the Apostle call, *v. 50. Flesh and Blood*; denoting, undoubtedly, *Men as living*, and compos'd of *Flesh and Blood*, not reduced by Putrefaction, and a long Corruption into Dust, and moulder'd into Atoms. For they ceas'd to be *Flesh and Blood*, nor could properly be so call'd. For the Apostle's Discourse was to the *Corinthians*, as consisting of *Flesh and Blood*, and in them to all *Mankind*, who tells them this Mystery, That at the Resurrection we shall not all sleep, or be dead,

dead, but some will be alive at that very time, *vid. Thessalon. cap. 4. ver. 13, 14.* who will be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an Eye, at the last Trump. For this Corruptible must put on Incorruption, and this Mortal put on Immortality, before it can be pronounc'd, That Death is swallowed up in Victory, *1 Cor. 15. ver. 51, &c.* Where it is very observable, that the Apostle in all the whole Course of his Writing says, *We*, not our Bodies, who cannot be call'd *We*, as *We* shall not all sleep; *We* shall be rais'd incorruptible, and *We* shall be changed; which could not be true, were the Soul our better part, an Incorruptible Immortal Being already, for that has no change at all, but retains its first Immortal Nature, (if the *Psychomathist* says true) and it consequently never can be Reviv'd.

2. The end of the Resurrection, which is the bringing Men to Account for the Deeds done in the Flesh, would seem vain and needless, *John 5. v. 28, 29.* The Hour is coming, in the which all that are in the Graves, shall hear his Voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil unto the Resurrection of Damnation. For if the Souls of good Men, when they died, went immediately to Heaven, and the Souls of the wicked immediately to Hell, what need of a general Day of Judgment

ment to call Men to account for their Actions? If they are in Heaven already, they have their *ultimate End and Reward*; if in *Hell their Punishment*; a Revocation from either of which is granted to be neither probable nor possible.

This Argument, I am so bold as to challenge all the World to answer, it being so well grounded on the firm *Basis* of Reason, as well as Religion. Nor can it upon any reasonable Ground be suppos'd, that the *reunion of the Body to the Soul*, can in it self add any thing to Man's Happiness or Misery: I say, *in it self*, because the Soul is by the *Psycomuthist* still'd the *All-sense*, and whatever Affections of Pain or Pleasure Man sustains, it redounds on the Soul only. I must confess, if there be a particular Decree, or Ordination of God Almighty determining it so, I will never dispute it; but until that Decree appears, wherein it is said, *that the Body added to the Soul, after the Resurrection, augments Man's Happiness or Misery*, I look upon such Doctrine to be precarious, and founded only on irrational Conjecture. What the Scripture says, I readily consent to, and believe; but the Philosopher tells you, *That Matter cannot effect an Immaterial Being with Pleasure or Pain, and where Matter is purely passive, it is capable of neither*. To confirm the first Position, the
Scrip-

Scripture it self gives us evidence; when the Angel of God ascended in the Flame of Fire made by *Manoah*, without any sensibility of Pain, undoubtedly, or Injury, *Judg. cap. 13. v. 20.* and the latter is so plain, and self-evident, that it needs no Argument to prove it.

3. This Judgment of the Quick and Dead, is said to be *precisely after the Resurrection*, and not before: So that if the Soul were in a State of Happiness or Misery, as soon as separated from the Body, *it must be pre-judg'd before a Resurrection*; which is contrary to the whole Tenour of Scripture. *Judge nothing*, says St. Paul, *before the time, until the Lord come, who shall bring to light the hidden things of Darkness*, 1 Cor. cap. 4. v. 5. that is, at the coming of our Saviour, shall all things be reveal'd, when we must all appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ, that every one may give an account of himself to God, Rom. cap. 14. v. 10. 12. The business of which Day St. Jude tells you more emphatically. *Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints to execute Judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly Deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and all their hard Speeches which ungodly Sinners have spoken against God*, Jude v. 14. 15. So that the Bu-
siness

finess of that Day appears plainly to be, to call Men to account for Works done in the Flesh,
 in order to receive their Sentence of Glorification or Condemnation. I know some Divines urge the necessity of a genenal Judgement, notwithstanding Mens being glorified or condemned before-hand; viz. *That Sinners may in the Face of the World be convicted and brought to publick Shame for their Offences, and that the Righteous may in like manner be publickly commended and rewarded.* This is a very pretty Notion indeed to please vulgar Heads, and couzen a rustick Understanding into the Obedience of Religion and Belief of a Resurrection; and so far I like it well, as St. Paul says, 2 Cor. cap. xij. 16. *I caught you with guile, dolo, with deceit.* But if we scan the depth of it, it bears no wgeiht. For what is it, or will it be to any hardned reprobate Sinner, who despairs of Salvation, or any ease of his Torments, as undoubtedly the Damned do, to be told publickly, and in the Face of the World, *That for his Sins he must be eternally damn'd?* What will be Shame to such an one? certainly none at all: For Despair makes a Man in this World, where it can hardly ever be supposed to be equivalent to that of the Damn'd, break through all Bounds and Fences of Modesty, (that Vertue from whence Shame arises) nay, even all Religion too, and beyond our Conceptions, hardens him
 into

into Impudence: Thus we see by common Observation in Men condemned to die *ignominiously* at the Gallows, with what Impudence, and strange effrontery they bear their Sufferings; nay, even when they ought to have a check and remorse of Conscience for fear of an immediate *Judgment* or punishment for their Sins by God Almighty, as soon as the *Breath is out of their Bodies*; which, one would think, should not only bring Shame on them, but *confusion of Face* too, yet we often see it does not; and therefore sure a *Despairing Reprobate Damned Sinner* can have but little Shame on him in that Day. Nor indeed would the solemn business of that Day be of any great consequence, if it were only *publickly to pronounce Sentence in confusion of the Wicked, and manifestation of God's Glory before all the World*; for their Sentence can never bring Shame; and God's Glory is manifested enough by the *Examination before Him, and the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and of all the World*; nay, more than by a bare pronouncing the Sentence of Damnation or Salvation: Besides, the Texts before-mentioned plainly intimate more than a bare pronouncing of Sentence; for *Men will be call'd to account, that is, they must Answer for their good and bad Deeds, &c.* All which manifestly declare an *Examination, Scrutiny and Searching into Men's Ways*
and

and Actions; and a trying whether they be able to justify themselves before God, what they have done in their Life-time: So the end of calling Men to hear this Publick Sentence, cannot be the business of that solemn and Great Day. Therefore the end of the Resurrection, seems to be subverted by Mens being in their Souls prejudg'd, either to Damnation or Salvation before the General Day of Judgment:

Thus I think I have evidently and sufficiently prov'd Three Grand General Propositions I laid down pag. 6. and as for the Fourth I will prove when I come to examine the Consequences of such an Opinion about the *Soul*. In the next place I think it fit to recite to the World, what ought to be construed the *Soul* of every Living Creature.

As I have before specify'd my Thoughts, grounded on the Authority of the Scriptures, concerning the *Soul*, that it can be no more than *Breath of Life*, if that Authority will be believ'd before Philosophy, so I will here explain my self more particularly in the Controversy. First, then as to the Definition of the *Soul* I assert it to be a *Breath, or Power, Originally infus'd by God into Insensible Matter, by which that Matter lives and exerts Sense and Reason, whercon I remark this, That*

1. *Anima* the *Soul* is said to be an *Afflatus*, *Breath*, or *Active Power* (for I do not take it to be the common *Air* or *Breath* from our *Lungs*; because it is apparent that *Embrio's* live before they breath) as 'tis often us'd to signifie in *Scripture*, call'd in *Latin* *Spiritus*, or *Spirit*, as relating to the *Power* of *God*, it is said, *Job* 33. v. 4. and *Job* 34. cap. ver. 10. vid. *The Spirit of God hath made me*, and the **BREATH** [*Power*] of the *Almighty* hath given me *Life*. Again, By the *Word* of *God* were the *Heavens* made, and all the *Host* of them by the **BREATH** of his *Mouth*, *Pfal.* 33. v. 6. All which, and the like Expressions, certainly can relate to nothing but the *Omnipotent Power* of *God*, signified here by the *Word* *Breath*. And as it denotes *Power* in *God* *Almighty*, so does it very frequently signifie a *Power* implanted in *Man*, call'd in *Scripture* *Spirit*, and relating to *Man's* *Creation*, stil'd *The Spirit* or *Breath of Life*. And because it is called *The Breath of Life*, what *Rational Man* can possibly conclude from thence, that *God* gave *Man*, by breathing into him, a *Spiritual Substance*? How comes *Breath of Life* to signifie a *Soul* consisting of *Spiritual Substantiality*, to speak in the *Language* of the *Metaphisicians*? What is it any more than that *God* made dead *Matter* or *Material Man* (i. e.) *Man* with his exterior *Shape* to become a *living Soul*, or *living Creature*; and indeed it would

would be an absurd Supposition to suppose, that God convey'd into him a *Spiritual Substance* by his *Nostrils*, or thorough his *Nostrils*, because God breath'd into *Mens Nostrils* the *Breath of Life*, Gen. 2. 7.

But to explain this *Power* more fully yet, I will use this familiar Example. Suppose a Bowl lyes still, and you take and throw it out of your hand on a Green, whilst it moves, that is a *Moving Bowl*, not in the least distinct in outward Form from one that does not move, now as soon as that *Power* or *Motion* impress'd on it, ceases, the Bowl returns again to be unmoved, as if a Dead Bowl. Motion all this while being no new Substance superadded to the Bowl, but another *Faculty* or *Power* which it had not before, and by which it ran, or was driven to such a distant place before it ceased, after which Cessation of Motion, quiet is obtain'd, and that Motion ends, or terminates in God, the first Mover of All Things ; I mean, not that it is a *Substance*, that passes directly to God, but it is transferr'd, and lost in some other movent Body, as the Air, &c. for sometime till it be renew'd again by another Power. Thus fares it with Man. God made him first of the *Dust of the Earth*, a dead unmoving Lump, of this form he now bears, call'd *Man*, before *Life* was given Him, Gen. 1. v. 27. God created Man. Here He

was as a dead Bowl without motion, then God gave him a wonderful extraordinary Power, viz. *Life, or Breath of Life*, Gen. 2. 7. by which Man became a *Living Creature*, or *Living Soul*. Which when it ceases, Man returns to Dust again, and becomes a meer Lump of Earth, as at first, and would for ever have remain'd so, (for ought the generality of the World knew) had not the Doctrine of the Resurrection inform'd us, that *Man will revive, or live again at the Resurrection*, when God by his Omnipotent Power shall raise all Men from the Dead, and give them *Life* again: So admirably well expressed by *Isaiah, ch. 37.* that it deserves your Reading. Carry but the Thought of such a Similitude from Motion, as here represented, and 'tis easy to answer that usual, though uncouth Question (because Men will conceive no other Notion of *Soul* but *Substance*) *Whether does the Soul go after Death!* Answer, *It goes to God that gave it, but not in the form of a Substance*, because that would make God to receive the Souls of the *Wicked*, as well as the *Just*, into his Bosom, Favour or Care; which God, the Fountain of Holiness, cannot be supposed to do, if the *Souls* of all Men *indistinctly* went *Substantially* to God. So that *Life* is a Power, that God gives to dead matter, as a Commission (as it were) to act by, and when He pleases,

resumes that Power again, as *Psf.* 104. Now a Commission we know adds no bulk to a Man, that is made a General; but it adds such a Power to him, distinguished by another Title, like *Living Man* to *Dead Man*; that, as to Action and Command He is quite a different Thing from what He was before, and returns to His Primitive State, if that Commission be taken from Him, or superseded. These familiar Instances, I hope will satisfy the *Erroneous prejudic'd Judgments* of the weaker sort of Mankind, who are deluded with a *Specious Philosophical Lye*, for I can call it no better, and are taught to reject the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, for the *Traditions of Men, and Rudiments of the World*.

What I shall add more concerning this my Notion of the *Soul*, is to consider some few of the *strongest Principal Objections*, usually brought to confound my Opinion, tho' *All* of them ought in *just Reason* to be otherwise expounded, than usually they are, because they *must* else be *inconsistent* with, nay, *contradictory* to that Text mention'd, *Gen.* 2. v. 7. in relation to Man's Creation (as before-mention'd) tho' I my self should err in my Exposition of them.

The first of these, which I now mention, is that of *Eccles.* 3. v. 21. (For that of *Eccles.* 12. v. 7. I have answer'd already, pag. 81.) Who

knoweth the Spirit of a Man that goeth upward, or the Spirit of a Beast that goeth downward, therefore this Soul of Man is that Spirit which ascends to Heaven, and the Soul of Beasts, that which descends to the Earth.

Answ. That by the Word *Spirit* is not meant a *spiritual Substance in Man*, the Sense of the Words, context and various Commentators, plainly infer. *Junius* says, *Quis horum alterum aut utrumq; vidit?* Who hath seen either of the Spirits whether they ascend upward, or descend downward? *Qui sensus nihil habet impium, which Interpretation has nothing of Impiety in it, vid. Pool. Synops.* as if he should have said, who has so much knowledge as to explain, whither the *Spirits of Men and Beasts* go when they die, the Question inferring only the Difficulty of Men's Apprehensions. And, indeed, the whole Context seems to confirm this Exposition, because it is a comparative Contest between the Excellency of Man and Beast. *The Sons of Men are themselves but Beasts. v. 18. And they have all one Breath, v. 19. So that a Man has no Pre-eminence above them. All go unto one place, all are of the Dust, and all turn to Dust again. v. 20.* Upon which Consideration, the Question is put, *Who knoweth the Spirit, &c.* As if he should have said, where the Life or rather Breath of Life goes when Man and Beast die? Life and Spirit being frequently the same

same thing in Scripture. *As thou knowest the way of the Spirit, or Breath of Life; or how the Bones do grow in the Womb of her that is with Child.* Eccles. 11. v. 5. All demonstrating the great Difficulty of comprehending what becomes of the *Breath of Life*, that God gave Man, when he breathes it out and dies, not in the least inferring a *spiritual Substance separated from the Body*, and flying to some other place, or *Ubi*, and there to reside until the Resurrection. For if this were the Genuine Sense of the Words, then it not only attributed a *local Transition* of the *Spiritual Being* of Man, but also the like in *Beasts*, and consequently a *Spiritual Substance* distinct from the Body of *Beasts*, would as much separately exist, and pass *downward* into some place beneath, as that of Man *upward*, which I presume no *Psychomutalist* will assert.—
But,

Then, there is another Interpretation of this Text hinted at by some, tho' not so plainly prov'd by such Genuine comment, or Exposition, as might be justly demanded in the case; which is this, *Qui novi Spiritum hominis, Qui [Homo] ascendit, & Spiritum Jumenti, Quod descendit ad Terram?* who knoweth the Spirit of Man, who [Man] goeth upwards to Heaven; or the Spirit of a Beast, which [Beast] goeth downwards to the Earth? This Interpretation, indeed, is naturally enough,

nough, and suitable to the Contexts, and subject matter therein contain'd, viz. relating to the difference of the Pre-eminence of Man above a Beast, and the difficulty of our Knowledge and Ability to comprehend whether Man goes to Heaven, and a Beast to the Earth, and totally perishes; here meant by going upwards and downwards. Neither doth this interfere with the Original, when the Particles *Qui* and *Quod* are totally excluded by the Hebrew (נ) as it is a Note of Interrogation (vid. *Pool. Synops.*) and signifies *An* or *Utrum*, whether Man and Beast go to different places, seeing it is said but the verse before, *They all go to one place*, v. 20. which, says M. Pool, infers only a difficulty, and not an impossibility for us to comprehend. But I rather think it fully and sufficiently answered before, as meaning, *who knoweth whither the Spirit, or Breath of Man goeth upward, and the Spirit or Breath of a Beast that goeth downward*, seeing the Royal Preacher says v. 19. *They have all one Breath.*

The Second Grand Objection is this. *Fear not them that can kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both Body and Soul in Hell.* Mat. 4. 28. Therefore there is a Being in Man, distinct from his Body, capable of being cast into a Place of Torment, when

when as the Body only lies in the Power of Man and not the Soul, to be destroy'd.

Ans. Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase on this Text is to this purpose, *not to be afraid of the Power and Malice of Man, for the utmost he can do is to kill your Bodies, but your Souls he cannot kill.* And much to the same sense doth give a Paraphrase on the 12th. of St. Luke 4. *'Tis not all the Malice of Men, that can extend farther than God's Providence will permit, even in things of very little Matters.* Therefore if two Sparrows are sold for a Farthing, they shall not fall to the ground without your Father, *Mat. 10. v. 29.* Your Hairs of your Head are numbred, *v. 30.* Fear ye not therefore, *v. 31.* You are of more value than Sparrows, *v. 34.* I came not to send Peace, but a Sword, *v. 35.* To set a Man against his Father, *v. 36.* Daughter against her Mother, &c. and *v. 39.* He that findeth *his Life*, shall lose it, and he that loseth *his Life for my sake* shall find it; from all which, as being the Contexts, I make these following Remarks.

1. That hereby is not means a *Substantial* Spirit in Man, but *only the Life of Man*, is here term'd Soul. For our Saviour, as by the whole Tenour of the Chapter, forewarns several of the Persecution they would suffer for Christianity, but exhorts them to undergo it chearfully, showing how far the
Power

Power of Man could go, and no farther, (*i. e.*) to the taking away this present Life, or destroying the Body in which Life is implanted. But as St. Luke says (who is the best Expositor of the other Evangelists) *after that have no more that they can do*; therefore fear him, who after he *hath killed, hath power to cast into Hell*, Luke 12. 4, 5.

2dly, 'Dr. Hammond himself upon v. 31. ' says, This is a full Ground of all Confidence ' and Courage to you, your *Lives* are ' dearly valued by God, and will not by him ' be neglected or prodigally wasted. Nay, all along the Texts following above recited, plainly refer to God's Providential Care of protecting his Servants from the danger *their Lives* would be in, and therefore draws it up as a Conclusion, v. 39. *If they do lose it they shall have Life everlasting in exchange for it.*

3dly. It must be interpreted *Life* in this Text as well as in the Subsequent, for in both the Greek Word $\Psiυχ\eta$ signifies the same, tho' here translated *Soul*, and v. 39. translated *Life*, and also the Latin Word in both places is *Anima*, according to the Vulgar Translation, and Tertullian, *vid. Bibl. Magn.* as it is Mat. 16. v. 26. *Animam amitet*, and Gr. $\Psiυχ\etaν Ζητεισθ\etaν$, as it follows likewise; Luke 12, 22. *Ne de Anima vestra cogitate*, Take no care for your Life, &c.

4thly. If St. *Matthew* had meant here *Soul*, as a distinct spiritual Being, undoubtedly in so material a Point, St. *Luke* would have used the same Expression, but he making no distinction, says only *after they have killed the Body, have no more that they can do*; their Power and Malice is at the utmost stretch, but God's Power reaches farther, for he can cast him or that Body he hath killed into Hell. Therefore I take the meaning of the Words to be no more than this, *Fear not those who can take away this present Life, by destroying the Body in which God has implanted it, (as I said before,) but rather fear him, i. e. God, who is able to punish you [living Man, consisting of Life and Matter] with Eternal Death.* Now that this is a true and genuine Answer to the fore-mentioned Objection, the Expositions and Contexts relating to the Comparison of this *present Life* with that of *Eternal*, seem plainly to confirm. For as to the literal Expression of *killing the Soul*, I have no reason to be bound by it, because it is as great a *Solæcism* to say *kill the Life*, as it is to say *kill the Soul*; for *Life* can never be said *to be killed*, tho' the Subject of it may be destroy'd, and so for a time it will cease to be. So the literal Expression, *cast the Soul into Hell*, as into a place of perpetual Torment, cannot be reasonably interpreted *casting the spiritual substance*

stance of Man into Hell, because altho' it is call'd *Soul*, the Expositions and the Context distinguish it not from *Life*, much less call it the *Immaterial Substance* of Man. And were it in common use, it might be as proper to say *Life and Body*, as *Soul and Body* will be cast into Hell, according to a literal Interpretation of the whole Text; But if in Scripture literal Interpretations were to be followed, we could hardly make Sense I doubt of many places, nay, some would plainly contradict the other. As for Example; if the Papist urges the literal Expressions of *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, to prove the *real presence* of our Saviour in the Sacrament, notwithstanding They are two plain, easie, positive Propositions, yet because they not only contradict their Reason and Senses that our Saviour should give away his Body *really* to Eat, at the same time he sat at the Table with the very same Body, he is said to distribute, but also because it was never receiv'd into the Church as a Mystery of Religion, you presently recur to another meaning of that so plain a Text (as it is) and never consider the parallel case is this, when I tell you, that *killing the Soul* can signifie no more than *taking away that Life which is to come*, which is not in the power of the Malice of Man to do. Besides, if by this Text was meant a *spiritual substance*

substantial, immortal Soul, no doubt but our Saviour knew it, and so did his Disciples to whom he then preach'd this Doctrine, therefore for our Saviour to instruct them in a Doctrine, viz. *The Impossibility of Man's Power to kill an Immortal spirit*, which they must know before, if true, would savour more of trifling than giving of real Instructions in Christianity; for it might easily be return'd, *That all the World knows an immortal spirit cannot be killed, so that such Instructions are vain and useless*, but God forbid we should have so mean thoughts of our Saviour's Doctrine and Instructions. But to reduce this Argument into a Syllogistical Form will be the best way to find out its strength or force, as thus.

That living substance which cannot be killed by the Power of Man, is Immaterial (for the Controversie strictly taken is not at the Immortality; but the immaterial substance of humane Soul.)

But the Soul of Man is that living Substance, ergo, &c.

Answ. There is no necessary connexion between *Immortal*, or and not being able to be killed or destroy'd, and *Immateriality*; For tho' *Immaterial* may necessarily infer *Immortal*, yet it is not here in the reverse, For *Adam*, all grant, would with his *material Body* have been in a state of *Immortality* out of the Power of being killed by Man, had he
not

not forfeited his Innocence, therefore a *living substance which cannot be killed by the power of Man, may be material*. Again, the minor Proposition wants proof egregiously, seeing it is deny'd to be a *Substance*. But say you——

That *living substance* which cannot be killed by the power of Man, is naturally Immortal.

And the *Soul* of Man is that *living substance*, ergo.

Answ. Here the minor Proposition wants the same proof as before to convince us of its being a *Substance*; for I do aver *Life* to be the *Soul* of Man, and no *substance*; but only an *Essential Property* of a *living Creature*, without any respect to the *Mortality* or *Immortality* of the same, according to the duration of which it will be coævous, (*i. e.*) in Mortal Beings, mortal; in Immortal ones, Immortal,

And now because I have reduc'd into Mood and Figure, according to the strictest, and most succinct way of Argumentation one of the chiefest, if not the only and Principal Text, which seems to oppose and confound my Opinion, give me leave to bring a parallel on the other side.

It is *pro confesso* granted by all Defenders of this *Immaterial Immortal Substance* in Man, called *Soul*, That the *Souls* of the wicked are tormented in Hell, as soon as separated by Death
from

from the Body, which I humbly conceive not to be consistent with Infinite Justice, as thus I prove.

To præjudge a Sinner to torment without Examination of his Crimes, is not consistent with Infinite Justice.

But he that is tormented, as soon as Dead, is præjudged without Examination of his Crime, *Ergo*,

It is not consistent with Infinite Justice.

The first Proposition I take to be undeniably true, not only in respect of the Justice of God, which is Infinite, and cannot Err, but also amongst Human Law-givers, as *Nicodemus* said, *Doth our Law Judge*, [or *Condemn* as the word *κρίνει* and *κρίμα* imports frequently in Scripture] *any man before he hear him, and know what he doth?* John 7. 51. And sure I am where Infinite Justice is concern'd it is a more pressing Question, *Doth God præjudge, and præcondemn without Hearing and Examination?* Certainly, no; for he has præfix'd a time at which he will Examine, *Judge and Condemn* the Wicked by his Son Christ Jesus, seated on a Throne of Glorious Majesty, &c. And we have no *consist* from Scripture of any Prior Examination, Judgment, or Condemnation, before the General Day of Judgment.—

The third and last Objection is that of *Luke 23. 43. This Day, says our Saviour to the Thief on the Cross, Thou shalt be with me*
in

in Paradise; Therefore his *Soul* must be there with our Saviour, or else our Saviour's Words could not be admitted for Truth, for before the Thief's Body was buried, and laid in the Ground, as others were.

Answ. This Objection, tho' oft brought, I cannot see of what force it is, unless it be to tell us, that our Saviour spake to the *Soul* of the Thief, when he said, *Thou shalt be with me in Paradise.*

Thou Soul of the Thief, for owning me, shalt this day be with me in a State of Bliss: But, O Thief, thy Body shall go to Corruption as other Bodies do. Now what a Speech must such Men make for our Saviour, that give such an Interpretation of this Text, let the Learned judge; I presume, *Thou*, in all other cases else, signifies the *Person* of, or whole *Man*.

Other Objections, usually brought, I refer my Unconvinc'd Reader to peruse in the Book it self, call'd *Second Thoughts concerning Human Soul*, and I do positively aver, that He shall make me a Convert, if He can make *Breath of Life* to be a *Substantial Spirit*, as *Gen. 2. 7.* frequently mention'd here to be the *Great stumbling Block never to be pass'd over.* So now I come to consider the Learned Mr. *Dodwell's* Opinion, in relation to an *Immortalizing Spirit.*

T H E

Second Letter.

*To the Reverend Mr. Sam. Clark, A. M.
and Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich.*

S I R,

I Took the pains, not without some satisfaction of Mind, to peruse Mr. *Dodwell's Epistolary Discourse concerning the Soul*, and your *Letter to Mr. Dodwell in Answer thereunto*. Now upon serious Consideration of *Both your Argumentations*, I must beg leave to say, That thus far you are *Both in the wrong*, inasmuch as neither of you tell the World *what that Soul is*, about whose *Mortality, and Immortality*, you *Both* so strenuously contend. What I take it to be, doth plainly appear by my *First Letter*; and when I find any Man *able to define* a better,

G

and

and truer Essence of the *Soul*, than what I have deduced from the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, then I will acquiesce in ascribing all those fine Qualifications of *Consciousness, Reasoning, Immortality, &c.* to the *Soul* of Man, as Both you have done. But if I find it Inconsistent with Right Reason, or, that which bears a Greater weight, the *Fundamental Principles of Christianity*, to split *Man* into *Two Halves* (as it were) by Philosophical Niceties, in order to lessen the Authority of the Scriptures, I presume, I may justly say, that *Both your Disputes* are about a *meer Supposition*. Let it but be granted, that a Ship may sail as well on *Salisbury Plain*, or *New-market-Heath* as on the Sea, and it is an easy Matter to tell the World which way she must be steer'd, if she be bound to, or from *London*. But if such a Supposition be by no means to be granted, as I presume, it ought not, what will all such a Controversy turn to about its sailing To, or From, but to a *Lusus Ingenij*, or *exquisite trifling*? Therefore first I advise ye Both to Agree what Kind of a Thing or Nature, That *Soul* is, concerning which this Controversy is started, and then adorn it with what Embellishments you please. For if God has made *Matter* or *Body*, as contradistinguish'd to *Spiritual Substance*, capable of *Thought*, as undoubtedly He hath, and can
(tho'

(tho' Bold Sciolists of this Age question his Omnipotence) then all your Reasoning falls to the Ground, and is but *as the crackling of Thorns under a Pot*. Then that Soul, for whose Immortality you Both so earnestly strive, in one Sense or other, viz. as separate from, or conjoyn'd with the Body after the Resurrection, can be no more than a *Supereminent Power* implanted in Matter, or United to Body, by which every living Creature exerts those Acts of Reason and Sensation, as we perceive our selves and them to do. Which Power when God is pleas'd to revoke, will never be reimplanted in the Body again any more, according to *ordinary Methods of Providence*, until after the General Resurrection, but by an *Extraordinary Method*, some Men have been, and may be reviv'd before the General Resurrection.

I remember in an Occasional Discourse with you about the Nature of the Soul of all living Creatures in general, you seem'd then to have more elevated Flights concerning the Souls of Brutes than you here express in this Letter to Mr. Dodwell, Telling me that you did not know but that the Souls of Brutes might be rais'd at a General Resurrection, as well as Human Souls, in order to be transmitted to some Peculiar Habitations, perhaps in Saturn, Mars, or Jupiter, &c. or Words to this Effect: Now that You did not know, and

might be rais'd, are Sentences very dubious,
 and are very far from bearing any Weight
 in Argumentation, however I look upon it as
 a part of great Modesty, not to assert too
 positively your Knowledge in Things of so
 Great, and Abstruse a Nature. I hope it
 will be no Offence to say that you are bred
 under one, who, may, for ought I know,
Be as Great a Physician, as He is a Divine,
 yet you cannot think hardly of me, if I
 say, *That I do not Know* that you understand
 Physick, I mean, the Practise of Physick in
 the least. Or if you do, or perhaps *may*,
 you must be a very Ill-Man if you Practise
 Physick, and any Person dies under your
 Hands, without a Lawful Commission Au-
 thorizing you so to do. For it is but a sor-
 ry Plea, That you would have, by saying,
You Do it for Charity, and to a Good End,
 tho' uncommission'd by a Lawful Publick
 Authority. Because you know the Exam-
 ple of *Uzza*, 2 Sam. ch. 6. is flatly against
 you, when against a positive Command of
 God, not to touch the Ark, He *too zealously*
 did it in order to save it from falling, be-
 cause the Oxen, which drew it, *shook the*
Cart, v. 6. *Yet the Anger of the Lord was*
kindled against Uzzah, and God smote Him
there for his Error, or Rashness, and there
He died by the Ark of God, v. 7. Thus up-
 on *Suppositions, and Do not Knows*, we can
 build

build no sound Reasoning: But this I will tell you, and 'tis *what I do know*, That as soon as I am Censor of the College of Physicians (as to apply your way of Reasoning to the Point, *I do not know how soon* I may be) I will do my Endeavour to Expose, if I cannot punish, all Ecclesiastic Quacks according to their Demerits, if any National Law will permit it, without breaking thro' an *Act of Toleration*.——As for my own part, if I am censur'd for *Quacking in Divinity*, as by some I may, I look on the Case to be far different from that of an Ecclesiastic's *Practising of Physick*, because He Exercises a *Function*, which, by the Laws of God and Man, He ought not to do. I only dispute here concerning a Philosophic Notion about the *Soul*, and show the ill and base Consequences it must have on Religion, desiring all good and sober Men to redress it. I do not invade the Exercise of their *Function*, by pretending to Preach, or *Administer the Sacraments*, &c. Now to have right Notions of Religion, and not be seduced by Falsities, and false Foundations, is every Christians Property, and the Law of God impowers, nay, *commands* Him to enquire after the Grounds of his Faith, and Salvation, *Acts* 17. v. 11. *John* 5. v. 39. and so in divers other Places: But as to the Invading the Rights of other Men's Functions, if

you do do it, I cannot forbear giving you that apposite Character of St. Paul, Rom. i. v. 22. of being *vain, in your Imaginations, and professing your self to be Wise, you become a Fool*, in the worst Sense in the Scriptures.

Thus you see how a Man may talk upon *Suppositions*, and the Parallel I take to be in Mr. Dodwell's, and your Argumentation, about the *Natural Immortality of the Soul*, which I now come seriously to consider, as by Him rang'd under several Heads of Argumentation, and by you under some Heads of *suppos'd* Confutation. But when I pretend to prove *You, and Mr. Dodwell*, in the wrong, I mean, as to the main Points in Controversy.

1. *That Man is not Immortaliz'd actually by the Pleasure of God to Punishments.*

2. *That the Union of the Divine Baptismal Spirit is not that Power which Immortalizes Man, But only a Conditional Grace, requisite to gain Immortality of Happiness by.*

3. *That the Bishops are not the only Conveyers of this Immortalizing Spirit, or Conditional Grace, as I call it.*

These

These I take to be the Principal Heads of the Controversy, and to these I design particularly to speak, not to every Paragraph almost as you have done, to show how Mr. Dodwell is inconsistent with Himself in many Places, how one Place contradicts another, &c. For the Grand Query is, *whether the Foundation of his Argumentation be True and Solid?* And the next Query of far greater Difficulty, *viz. Whether you have confuted the Opinion, and not the Man?* For why should any one trouble the World to show, as you infer, an ill manag'd Argumentation, when as perhaps another Man may prove yours to be as Bad, at least may make an uncautious Reader, by plausible Reasoning, believe it to be so. Therefore let us reason together concerning the *Mortality, and Immortality of the Soul*, if it be possible that we can Agree in the True Notion of it.

The Learned Mr. Dodwell says, *That the Immortalizing Presence of the Spirit, is in the Current of the New Testament, Not suppos'd to have been given to Any since the Loss of it by the Fall of Mankind, till the Resurrection of our Lord*, Præmon. Parag. 2. The Consequence of which Position, or Assertion, must be, That till the Resurrection of our Saviour, Man was left, by reason of the Fall, in a State of Mortality. And pray, Sir, what hurt is there in this Position, or Assertion,

G 4

tho

tho' I cannot say it is every way true? Because I am verily of the Opinion, and doubt not but to prove it, that there was an Immortalizing Spirit which gave actual Immortality to Man before Christ's Resurrection. Oh! but 'tis a sad Thing say you to teach, that *the Soul of Man is naturally Mortal*, by such an imprudent Title many will conclude the Soul to perish at the Dissolution of the Body, by which means Libertines, and Men of vicious Lives, will be encourag'd——vid. Mr. Clark's Letter to Mr. Dodwell, pag. 3. I must confess Mr. D—words are somewhat intricate, but as for the Soul's being *naturally Mortal*, if He owns a General Judgment, I see no ill Consequence at all. As for Those who hold its *Natural Immortality*, They may reject the Doctrine of the General Judgment, as useless, for Reasons mention'd in my former Letter, and that I am sure, is of far worse Consequence in Matters of Religion, than all you can say against it. For were your Notion of the Immortality of the Soul, either very plainly contain'd in Scripture, or very clearly demonstrable by right Reason, (tho' I had rather have plain Scripture-Proofs, because every Man calls his own Right Reason) which is not as you say pag. 4. nor ever can, then it were ill to broach such Opinions; therefore you ought to be careful how you give an occasion of Deceiving Mankind

Mankind by false Notions : But, concerning the Consequences, Good or Bad, of such an Opinion, I shall treat in a particular Chapter by it self. I confess also, that I wish Mr. *Dodwell* had took the Pains to discover to Us, as He is *certainly* able, if any Man is, to inform Us how it doth appear from Scripture, that Originally there was any *Immortalizing Spirit at all of the Souls of Men* ; For we find nothing more, than that *Man* by Eating the forbidden Fruit became *Mortal*, or Subject to Death, who by the common consent of all Divines, would not have otherwise have been, had He not so transgressed. Now what doth that Curse mention'd, *Gen. 3. 3.* relate to the *Mortality* or *Immortality of the Soul* ? It's plain no more than, had *Adam* been still in a state of Innocence He had enjoy'd actual Immortality. By the *Power* of God, according to His *Will* prædesigning the same. When I talk of *Immortalizing Spirit*, I look upon it to denote *Power*, and not *Will* of God, tho' you wonder why Mr. *Dodwell* should make a real Distinction between *The Spirit, and the Will of God*, and I as much wonder why you should not, as to the Conceptions Man is capable of forming a Distinction of the Attributes of God. For *Will* is necessarily antecedent to *Spirit*, and those Divine *Emanations* or *Influences* of the Holy Ghost on the

Pro-

Prophets were given them, because God had *Willed* them so to be convey'd before-hand. I know that Schoolmen talk of the Attributes of God in a Metaphysic Sense, and in high raptures very oft, *That every one of the Attributes of God, is God Himself, and that there is no distinction of them.* But let us now condescend to learn Common Sense, Reason and Scripture without Metaphysicavils, and then I will put this question, whether Mr. *Dodwell* be not more in the right than you, to ascribe the Existence of a Being in a Perpetual State, or State of Immortality, rather to the *Spirit of God*, which implies *Power* to conserve that Being in an Eternal Duration, than to the *Will of God*, which must imply a subsequent Execution of a Thing *Willed*, or by the *Eternal Will* design'd?

As for your other Reasonings or Argumentations, seeing they depend upon a Precarious Supposition, *viz.* That the *Soul is a Substance*, as appears by the Difficulties started, *That it is necessary that God should, to make Good Men capable of Eternal Duration, give them a new Principle of Substance, or add a new Substance to their Souls, as His Obscure Expressions concerning the Nature of the Soul* seem frequently to signify; as for those Reasonings, I say, either from Him, or You, they, *as to me*, are insignificant, because

cause both of you take that to be granted which is not, nor, indeed, in Reason, ever ought. So that the Dispute is no more than if you both should talk of the *Substantiality of Motion or Thought*, and deduce Problems whether it were of perpetual Duration, or not. Therefore I shall proceed, as I before laid it down, on those heads proposed, pag. 100. only with this Limitation, or Alteration, by using the Word *Man* instead of *Soul*; as,

1. *That Man is not Immortaliz'd actually by the Pleasure of God to Punishments.*

2. *That the Union of the Divine Baptismal Spirit is not that Power which Immortalizes Man; but only a Conditional Grace, requisite to gain Immortality of Happiness by.*

3. *That the Bishops are not the only Conveyers of this Immortalizing Spirit, or Conditional Grace, as I call it.*

Now if I am able to make good these Positions, or Assertions, by consequence, I shall have occasion some way or other to answer every Argument. This Learned Gentleman urges, as the true Ground of God's conferring *Immortality on Man*, either such as is call'd *Properly so*, viz. to Rewards, or *Im-*
pro-

properly so, viz. to Punishments, *Præmon.* paragr. 2. For my Opinion is, and I hope to prove my self in the right, That by our Saviour's coming into the World, Man was restor'd to a Capacity of obtaining and enjoying Immortality of Life, which Adam by Original Sin had forfeited, and that there was no Change in the Nature of Man, by the addition of a Baptismal Spirit, to entitle Him to Immortality.

These Propositions as they seem to infer great difficulty of Proof, I doubt not but that my Reader will be apt to enquire upon what Manner and Methods of proof I intend to insist on. To which I briefly answer, On the Authority of Divine Revelation, and not the Primitive Fathers of the Church, because I find in them almost as many different Opinions about a material Controversie, as there are Fathers of the Church; and altho' they in any Historical Narration requiring only the proof of Antiquity, as being nearer the times of an Action, than we now are, (tho' even then they may be deceiv'd in a Narration, as well as we frequently are in things done in this our Age) may gain better Credit or Belief; but when a Controversy arises, in which the Sons of this Age by Learning and Education, may be as competent Judges of the Truth of the Thing in Debate, as the Fathers of the former Ages, I see no reason why

reason why Antiquity in such a Point should pass for an undeniable proof, at least such an one as ought *not in Civility* to be cavill'd at. 'Tis upon this account I quote none of those Primitive Fathers, Mr. *Dodwell* cites of the first Ages of the Church, who asserted and abetted the *Mortality of the Soul*; but only say, it is well that they escaped being Burn'd by an Ignominious Hand in our Nation, at the instigation perhaps of some zealous Father, or other, of our Present Church; so letting those good old Gentlemen's Authority alone, I pass on to consider, and discuss my first Proposition.

I. *That Man is not Immortaliz'd actually by the Pleasure of God to Punishments.*

Now to make a narrow Scrutiny into this Proposition. It will be necessary to explain what I conceive this Learned Author to mean by *the Pleasure of God*, and what by *Immortaliz'd actually*; for if I do not rightly apprehend, and understand the Author, I may do against his Opinion, as many have done against mine, viz. Argue against what He never Meant or Intended, which many have done against my asserting the *Materiality of the Soul*. Wherefore I find in the Holy Scriptures, That *Pleasure* denotes either *Will or Delight*, i. e. the Faculty of a Living Crea-

Creature apply'd to Man, call'd otherwise the *Faculty*, or one of the *Powers of the Soul*; or a *Passion* resulting from that Faculty call'd *Delight*, or a *complaisance*, or a *grateful Acquiescence in a Thing Done or said*. Now as it is apply'd to God, it must be so in our Conceptions of Him, because our Finite Understandings are not otherwise capable of judging of the Nature of God, but by some reference to our own. As *Isaiah* says of God; *Remember the Things of Old, for I am God, and none else; I am God, and there is none like me, and I will do my Pleasure*, ch. 46. v. 9. 10. Thus again, *God will do His pleasure on Babylon, and His Arms shall be on the Chaldeans*. ch. 48. v. 14. which Phrases, or Expressions, relate singly to the *Will of God*, as we conceive it a Faculty inhærent in Him. Then we find it taken for *Delight*, as, *Is it any Pleasure that Thou are Righteous?* Job 22. v. 3. Again, *Have I any Pleasure at all that the Wicked should dye, saith the Lord God? And not that He should turn from his Ways and Live?* Ezek. 18. v. 23. so in several other Places, too numerous here to insert. So that upon the Grounds of these two Significations, They being the *only* to which this Expression can relate, Mr. *Dodwell* must mean, That God *Wills*, as in the first Acceptation of the Words; or *Delights*, as in the second, in *Immortalizing Men actually to Punish-*

Punishments ; in both which Senses, I aver, that God never intended to Immortalize Men to Punishments.

The first Notion of *Will* intimates a Power, arising from God's *Absolute Dominion* over all his Creatures ; notwithstanding which, tho' He could not do any injustice to Us, his Creatures, if He should upon that principle of *Absolute Dominion* condemn Us to perpetual or Immortal Punishments ; yet He is pleas'd so oft, and so very frequently in Holy Scriptures ; nay, I believe, I may say always to declare that Power *limited*, and all Punishments that He inflicts, *conditional*, that nothing can be more plain, wherefore I think it a very true deduction that He *Wills* no Man to *Immortal Punishments*. This was evident in the first Curse denounced, *Gen. 3*. The Condition was, that if Adam eat of the forbidden Fruit he should dye, v. 3. because He did so, v. 19. *Unto Dust shall thou return*. It would be in vain to show the whole Tenour of God's Justice in the OEconomy of the Jewish Nation, and to heap up Texts to prove, that God Almighty was never *willing* to punish the Wicked, but that He did it always with Reluctancy, and the Heinousnesses of Offences generally *excused* Consent, as I may say, to execute Vengeance against hardened and Impenitent Sinners ; because this one Text sufficiently proves

proves none to be *Immortaliz'd by the Pleasure of God to Punishment*, and this Text only ought to be particularly scand in reference to the *Immortality of Man by the Pleasure of God*, as I humbly conceive, in the Opinion of Mr. Dodwell, tho' He calls that *Immortality of the Soul*; but more of this elsewhere.

The next Expression to be consider'd, is contain'd in these Words *Immortaliz'd actually*; by which, if I understand that Learned Gentleman aright, He means *that the Soul naturally Mortal, is necessitated now to live in a State of Immortality [to Punishments] by the Pleasure of God*, or that God since the publication of the Gospel, has endow'd Ill Men now with a Principle of Immortality, which they had not before. I believe I take the Gentleman right in his *meaning*, tho' his Expressions are here, and in several other places, somewhat difficult to be understood. So that the result of the whole must be this, *That by the Pleasure of God, Wicked Men who deserve Eternal Punishments, are forced to undergo an Immortality of Misery*; to which, according to the Ingredients (as I may stile it) of their first Composition at the Creation, they were not liable; but would have dyed as *the Beasts that Perish*, or, as Job says, *would have been, as if they had never been*. And on the contrary, God by his Union of a Baptismal Spirit, has rendred Good Men

Men capable of, or put them into a fix'd State of Immortal Happiness, to which, before they were never entituled, but would have dy'd as the Wicked before-mention'd. Upon this account says Mr. D. *The actual Immortalizing Souls to Punishment, may possibly be better ascrib'd to the Pleasure of God, than to the Divine Spirit. Præmon. parag. 2.* To which I answer, no, to neither; But rather to *Divine Justice*, who has prescrib'd to its self certain Rules of Acting, from which it will never deviate, and has also in many cases recall'd the Execution of its Judgments, upon the repentance of Sinners, as in the Case of the *Ninevites* in *Jonas*, and of *Ahab*—And the Word of the Lord came to *Elijah the Tishbite*, saying, *seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me, because He humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the Evil in his days.* 1 Kings, ch. 21. v. 29. In both which Cases God undoubtedly *Willed* their Destruction; but upon Repentance, turn'd Himself from His fierce Anger, and was Reconcil'd. We may, indeed, say, it was his *Will*, or *His Pleasure*, so to do, and so, indeed, it may be said of all his Actions, because He first *Wills* them to be done, before He puts them in Execution; but if we examine into matters aright, we ought to distinguish between the *Acts of God's Will*, and the *Acts of God's Justice*, because the former imports an

Arbitrary Power, as I may say, grounded on His *Absolute Dominion* over His Creatures; but the latter a *limited Power*, viz. an Acting according to certain Rules (as I said before) which He has been pleas'd to prescribe to Himself, and adapted to the Capacity of Man's Understanding, in order to judge of them; and therefore *Abraham* in his pleading for the Wicked *Sodomites*, makes use of that medium of Argumentation to God Himself, *Shall not the Judge of all the Earth do right*, Gen. xviii. v. 25. and just before, v. 23. *Wilt thou destroy the Righteous with the Wicked?* nay, even God Himself appeals to the People of *Israel*, *Te say that the Way of the Lord is not equal*. Here now, O House of *Israel*, is not my Way equal? Are not your Ways unequal? When a Righteous Man turneth away from His Righteousness, and committeth Iniquities, and dieth in them, for His Iniquity that He hath done, shall he die. Again, when the Wicked Man turneth away from his Wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth what is lawful and right, he shall save his Soul alive. Because he considereth and turneth away from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die. Tet saith the House of *Israel*, The way of the Lord is not equal. O House of *Israel*, are not my ways equal? Are not your ways unequal? Therefore I will judge you, O House of *Israel*, every one accord.

according to his ways, saith the Lord God: Repent, and turn your selves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new Heart, and a new Spirit; for why will ye die, O House of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the Death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn your selves, and live ye. Here is the whole Scheme of God Almighty's dealing with Mankind according to the Rules of Justice, wherein He declares *He will judge the House of Israel according to His ways, I may say their Deserts; and that He has no Pleasure (or Delight, as it here intimates) in the Death of Him that dies.* Wherefore if God has made this the measure of his acting in inflicting Temporal Death, I cannot see why by the same Rules of Justice, we should not judge of God's inflicting Eternal Death. In the Parable of Dives and Lazarus, Luke 16. the same seems to be confirm'd in relation to Future Punishments, *For in Hell he lift up his Eyes, being in Torments, v. 23. because He had sinned in Living luxuriously, or faring sumptuously every Day, and despising the Poor, v. 19. 20. God sent him to that Place of Torments. And so Isaiah says—They shall look upon the Carcases of the Men that have transgress'd against me, For their Worm shall not*

dye, neither shall their Fire be quench'd., ch. 66. v. 24. So the same Expressions are frequently us'd in *Mark 9. v. 44. &c.* and denote a Punishment determin'd by reason of Offences, and not by the Pleasure of God. Wherefore this *Perpetuating Human Nature to Punishment*, as Mr. D— expresses it, *Præmon. Parag. 4.* cannot be so well ascrib'd, as he imagines, to the Pleasure, as to the Justice of God, nay, he seems by the Word *Possible* to diffide in his own Assertion, and I think, I may, in my Opinion, pronounce such a *Doctrine unscriptural*, and against some truly *Catholick Principles*, and therefore I desire he would think hard of these Sentiments, as he owns *Parag. 2.* Unless he can state a farther Limitation to those Words, *The Pleasure of God perpetuating Human Nature to Punishment*, and firmly be bound by those Standards of *Reveal'd Truth*, the Holy Scriptures.

Having thus consider'd the Efficacy of God's Will, as distinguish'd from his Justice, and finding the Grounds of *Punishment in general* ought to be ascrib'd to the latter, rather than to the former; perhaps it may be ask'd me by some Persons vers'd in the Learning of the School-men, whether God be Bound by the Obligation of his Justice to punish all Offenders with infinite Torments? For it is plain, that no Obligation to Punishment arises

rises from the *Will*, because it must be suppos'd to be a *Faculty*, that may *will* ten Thousand Things which it never puts in Execution ?

Ans^r. *Ius oritur ex delicto*, says the Civilian, And that *Faults* give a *Right to Punishment*, I look upon to be a Maxim of Eternal Truth, and such an one by which God himself is pleas'd to Act, but is not necessarily *obliged* to punish for every Fault ; because (as I told you before) he has ordain'd and constituted a *Medium*, viz. *Repentance*, to atone for the Punishment deserv'd. So that if no Repentance succeed the Fault, I look upon it, that God has *oblig'd* himself, then to punish every Offender in proportion to his Crime ; but whether every Offender against God may deserve *Eternal Torments*, or God is *oblig'd* upon the *Foundation of Justice* aforesaid to *perpetuate Human Nature to Misery*, for every Offence, is a Question of great Weight and Consideration. Mr. Dodwell thinks his Notions answers the Two Grand Difficulties, concerning *Eternal Torments*. 1st. In respect of *Reprobation*. 2^d. In respect to *Justice*. For, says he, Seeing God has renounc'd that *Absolute arbitrary Power* concerning the *Equity of his Proceedings with Mankind*, the *Foundation of Reprobation to Eternal Torments* is *overthrown* by what I have now said, because *Adam's Sin* makes no Man as he descends from

him, liable to *Eternal Punishment*: Because the *ixav* deriv'd from him, is by the Apostle himself suppos'd mortal, and therefore cannot qualify the Person so descending from him, to subsist under *Eternal Punishment*. So the harsh Doctrine of *Reprobation* by this is easily avoided, supposing the Nature of the Soul mortal. God may certainly choose what Persons, or Nations, he pleases for his *Præternatural Favours*, without derogating from his Goodness, and he may as freely pass others by, and not admit them. And all the Consequence of such a *Præterition* in reference to *Supernatural Favours*, would be, to leave them entirely to their own Nature, which as it would admit of no *Immortal Enjoyments*, so neither of *Immortal Calamities*. parag. 62. Thus much concerning *Eternal Punishments* in respect of the Doctrine of *Reprobation*, which he looks upon to be perplex'd by the Notion of the Soul's *Natural Immortality*, because it would leave Man in a State of *sustaining Eternal Torments* by the *Arbitrary Power of God*, and so indeed it does, but whether his Notion has solv'd this Difficulty, I will by and by consider, and pass on to the second Head in relation to *Eternal Torments*.

2d. His Notions (as he says) gives the easiest Account of the *Justice of Eternal Torments*, parag. 63. It is a very great Difficulty in our *Modern Theology*, to give a Reason why

why the Sins of Finite Creatures should be punished with endless Torments. The most plausible is, That of Dr. Hammond's, Option. Nor do I see any Thing harsh, if God do oblige us to accept of Eternal Pleasures, under pain, if we do not, of incurring Eternal Damnation, pag. 308. It is rather agreeable to his Goodness to oblige us to be happy, by such means as he knows most efficacious to our Reasonable Natures. But this can only take place in such cases, where the Persons are capable of Option; as in Infants dying unhaptiz'd, and Heathens, who never heard of the Gospel, these cannot make choice, and consequently are not liable to be perpetuated to Eternal Misery. But if God be pleas'd to leave both of them to their Natural Mortality, there is nothing harsh. Tet Infants may have the benefit of their Innocence (Reward they cannot pretend to) even in their Separate State. pag. 309. which is in the Air, the Adns, of the Antients, and the Common Receptacles of the Souls of the Just, and Unjust, p. 310. They may there receive Irradiations and Assistances from good Spirits, tho' intermix'd with Bad; and that Air may have more of the Conversation of Good Spirits, as being nearer to Heaven, the place of their constant Residence. This may make their Separate Condition more happy there, than in the World, p. 311. And that the Happiness of that Intermediate space between their Death,

+ and the General Judgment, may sufficiently reward the Sufferings of so short a Life as curs is. Tho' they enjoy not the highest rank of Glory as Favourites. Thus have I shown (says He) how God may by means unknown to Us, put it in their Power to attain this greater Honour, by allowing them the Benefit of Baptism in a separate State, with the means necessary to qualify them for it, of Preaching and Faith, pag. 312. As for the Fact that God has done so, I produce great Authorities of the freshest Memory of the Apostolical Tradition.

x The Consideration of *Eternal Punishments* being thus stated, 1. In reference to *Reprobation*; and 2. In reference to *Infinite Justice*, I do not see how it can be denied, but that the *Natural Mortality of the Soul* better answers those Difficulties, than its *Natural Immortality*. But then the Question comes, whether Mr. Dodwell has any Authority or Warranty from Scripture to deduce such a Doctrine from the Nature of *Human Soul*, abstractedly considered, or from the Nature of M A N as a corruptible Creature? For those very Texts of Scripture, on which he grounds his Argumentation, relate to *Man*, as a Living Creature, and not to his *Soul*, in an abstracted Sense. And, indeed, the very Notion of the *Soul* has perplex'd all our Divinity, and put learned Men to the streights to make the Scripture speak every where con-

conform to the Notions of Philosophy, rather than be accounted *Infidels* for disbelieving the *Immortality of the Soul*, in such manner as They by the Principles of Education had learn'd.

The Doctrine of *Reprobation* has been so much canvass'd in the World already, that I need not trouble my self, or my Reader, to recite the Arguments on either side, all that I have here to insist on is to enquire, how this Notion of the *Soul's Mortality* takes away the ill Consequences of it. This, says he, is done, *Because Adam's sin, as he descends from him, makes no Man liable to Eternal Punishment, and because also the $\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu$, deriv'd from him is by the Apostle St. Paul suppos'd mortal.* To which it may be easily answered, that as to *Reprobation* or *Rejection*, this holds not good, whether the SOUL be *Mortal*, or *Immortal*, the *Sinner* may still be liable to Eternal Punishment upon the account of his having offended an Infinite Deity. For, what if the Soul be *mortal* in its own nature, God can make it capable of enduring Eternal Punishments, as well as if it had been *Immortal*, and the giving of it that *Power of perpetual Duration*, would have been justly the part of its punishment. If it had been in its own Nature *immortal*, it relates nothing to the *Reprobation* or *Rejection* by the meer Will of God, as some pretend to explain it, neither

neither does it excuse the harshness of the Sentence either way ; For if the *Soul* (as Mr. D—— calls it) were made *Immortal* by God, he leaves it to *its own Nature*, and inflicts Punishments on it for the Sins it committed against his Divine Essence whilst in the Body, superadding nothing to make its Duration a part of the Punishment : And what Mr. D—— says, *As it would admit of no Immortal Enjoyments, so that* [meaning the Soul] *would admit of Immortal Calamities,* seems to be no Salvo at all, unless it be totally to destroy that Doctrine of *Reprobation*. For if the Soul be totally lost, or become, as I may say, *annihilated*, (for its next to it) what effect can the Thoughts of that *Reprobation* have ? Only, *let us eat and drink for to-morrow we dye*, and are reduc'd into a state of insensibility of pain, or pleasure, and therefore we will make the best of it, while we live ; and if we sin, or not, we can *only dye*, and there is an End of Us. Therefore this Notion of the *Mortality of the Soul* does not salve the Difficulty, that pretends ; As for God's bestowing his *præternatural Favours* without derogating from his Justice, I own he may, because Favour is a *voluntary Act*. But if God makes Justice, in respect of *Damnation*, or *Punishments*, the measure of his acting, and that he is no *Respector of Persons*, *Acts x. v. 34*. Why do we not ascribe his dealing

dealing so severely with Mankind, as some imagine, to the Methods of his *Infinite Justice*, rather than to his meer *Will or Pleasure*? He sets before us *Death and Life*, Deut. 30. 19. call'd *the Way of Life, and the Way of Death*, Jer. 20. v. 8. wherein we have *Choice*; and if we execute Judgment, Ec. v. 12. and observe his *Laws*, we shall be in a state of immortal *Happiness*, not, as I presume, by *Compulsion*; so that if we refuse *Happiness*, we shall be necessitated to *Misery*. Only there is this consequence in it, I confess, that if we refuse happiness, we shall have no middle state, but be miserable of course, because we had *Choice* but of Two things. So that the *Arbitrary Power* of God forces Us not into that state of *Misery*, but we know the Danger, yet will run into it; God has prescrib'd us Rules how to avoid it, yet we deviate from those very Rules, and 'tis our Crimes, not God's *Arbitrary Power*, that brings Us to a state of *Reprobation*. This Notion shewing the Nature of *Reprobation* may, perhaps, be New, but I look on it to be true, because I would rather reconcile things to *Justice*, than to *Arbitrary Power*, if it can be so done, and why should it not? St. Paul in the 9th. Chap. of the *Romans* (a Chapter particularly relating to *Reprobation*) treats of the Mercies of God bestow'd on whom He will, and the Favours of God to-
wards

wards his peculiar People, the Seed of *Abraham*, which Favours God may undoubtedly bestow on what Person or Nation he pleases; but on he refers to the case of *Punishments*, as that of *Pharaoh*, v. 17. *Even for this same purpose have I rais'd Thee up, that I might shew my Power in thee*, as if it intimated the punishment of *Pharaoh* with Plagues, meerly that his Name might be declared throughout all the Earth, as it follows in the same Verse; yet if we refer it to *Exod. ch. 9.* from whence *St. Paul* quotes it, there God gives the Reason of the Justice of his Acting, tho' *St. Paul* mentions it not, because *Pharaoh* refus'd to let the People of *Israel* go, v. 2. nay, exalted himself against the People of the Lord, and would not let them go, v. 17. altho' he had before promis'd, ch. 8. v. 8. 28. And so I am apt to think that is in all other Cases, if thoroughly examin'd, that God punishes none *mero arbitrio*, but, as I said before, *jure Delicti*; But then the main Question is, secondly.

2. Whether it be consonant with the Justice of God to punish Sins of Finite Creatures with endless torments? I must own, it is a very intricate Doctrine, and never yet solv'd, as I have met with, to any tolerable satisfaction, unless by calling it an *Heiretical Opinion* of *Origen*, which is the New way of Confuting what we are not able to Answer. But above all, I do not see how Op-
tion,

tion, as Mr. D— concurs with Dr. Hammond, or the Hypothesis of *Men dying, and never rising again*, salves the matter. Indeed such Men are safe, and out of danger of Eternal Torments; but what shall we do with those *who have heard the Gospel, and not liv'd up to the Rules thereof*? Why? in Mr. D— Opinion, Christianity is so far from being a Blessing to Mankind, that it is the *most dangerous state* imaginable, because by it he is put into a state of being Eternally miserable, and then *it will not be harsh in God to oblige us to accept of Eternal Pleasure, under pain, if we do not, of incurring Eternal Damnation*, pag. 308. Now, is not this a strange sort of Option, or Choice, when we are oblig'd to do a Thing? What if Alexander the Great had oblig'd Diogenes to have quitted his Tub, and have accepted of a large and ample Province for his peculiar Government? Can any Man call this Choice? Now, if this would be preposterous in Man, as it appears to me it would be so, how ridiculous is it, nay, I may say impious, to charge God with such Ways of dealing with Mankind? If Mankind has a Free Will, and an Understanding, the former must never be *obliged or compelled* in a matter of Choice, for it destroys the very Nature of its Freedom, and the latter must be left free also to judge which is most eligible *Evil or Good*, where-ever

Choice

Choice is concern'd. If it Err in the Choice of Evil before Good, and the Error be Invin- cible, the Crime deserves Pardon, nay, can hardly be call'd a *Crime* at all. But if that Error be an *Acting* contrary to Commands, or Right Reason, then it deserves Punish- ment. But the Instance I have given here is not between *Evil* and *Good*, but between a *lesser Good*, and a *greater Good*, can any ra- tional Man call it *Option*, if we are obliged to choose the *Greater Good*, when our Inclinations are strongly bent to choose the *Les- ser*, and we may do it without an Offence also, and consequently deserve no Punish- ment, where there is no Offence? Sure I am we charge God foolishly, as it is express'd, *Job* 1. 22. to say his Justice is answer'd by allow- ing us a *compulsive Choice*, for it is no better, in *Persons capable of Option*. Now, to bring the matter to a full Issue; God, by setting before us Eternal Rewards, and Eternal Pun- ishments, as Life and Death, leaves Us to our Choice, and if we are so foolish as to choose the latter, 'tis *We* do our *Selves* the Injury, and not God; that is, we choose the *Ways of Sin and Wickedness*, and refuse to walk in the ways of *Righteousness*, as it is in the Language of the Scripture, and conse- quently deserve Punishment: Not, as I ap- prehend it, by reason of our *negative Sinning*, as I may call it, that is, for refusing to ac-
cept

cept of Happiness God has oblig'd us not to refuse, because such an Obligation is absurd, and no where to be found in Scripture; but because by that Choice we actually and positively sinned, and when we knew what Punishments we must undergo before hand, viz. Eternal, we thereby became liable to suffer those Punishments for our Actual Sins God denounces against Us. And this I take to be a better Salvo upon the account of God's infinite Justice, than Option, or any other I have yet met with.

As to those Persons, *viz. Infants unbaptiz'd, and Heathens*, who never heard the Gospel, and cannot, by Mr. D——'s Opinion, be liable to be perpetuated to *Eternal Misery*, (because he ascribes the Greatest of Miseries possible to be endur'd, *viz. Eternal Damnation*, to those who enjoy the Benefit of the Gospel; strange Benefit, indeed! if what he says were true) such Persons, I pronounced, just before *safe*, but having considered the subsequent Discourse they are not *safe* neither. For their Souls are in the *Adm* the common Receptacle of the Air, where the Souls of the *Wicked* are also, and the Devils, or Demons themselves cohabit, pag. 244, 245, &c. and consequently they may, as his way of arguing is, prevail over little *Infants* and ignorant *Heathens*, whatever they may do over the more learned *Heathens*, to
work

work in them all manner of Wickedness in spite of the good Angels their Guardians, who attend them but *now and then*, and are at a great distance. I hope my Reader will pardon me, and Mr. Dodwell also, if I make use of his *own Words*, and his *own Expressions*, to prove what I assert, or in defence of my *Supposition*, as he doth his,—— *If God be pleas'd not to leave Infants and Heathens, who never heard the Gospel, to their Natural mortality, but places them amongst the Company of Devils, and makes them subject to Temptation, as not having the Grace of God to support them, it seems to me, that it would be something harsh; and Infants by reason of such vile Conversation, may not have the Benefit of their Innocence, but be perverted, and forfeit it, even in their separate state, where one would think they were out of danger. And they may not receive sufficient irradiations and assistances from good Spirits, because they are so intermix'd with bad Souls,* pag. 310. and consequently good Spirits may irradiate them also at some time or other, tho' there is no hopes *in that place* of Converting a Devil to Christianity. Besides that Air, or common Receptacle, may not have more conversation of the good Spirits than any other place, tho' they are nearer to Heaven, the Place of their constant Residence; for nearness signifies nothing to Spirit, which moves as quick as Thought,

and

and never peirces the Medium thro' which it moves, (if we will believe philosophic Romances.) Wherefore Conversing amongst Devils, tho' good Angels should visit them sometimes, it may make their separate Condition less happy for the time of their Duration, than it was in this World, whilst they are within the Devil's Jurisdiction, pag. 311. Indeed those good Heathens would have but a poor amends for the Infelicities suffer'd in this Life, by that pretended happiness of that intermediate state between their Death and Judgment, nor would they be sufficiently rewarded for the Sufferings of this short Life, if that were their only Reward. Thus I have shown you how God may by Means unknown to Us, put it out of the Power of the good Heathens to attain any Honour at all, much less become the Favourites of Heaven, tho' you allow them the benefit of Baptism in a separate State, and the Means also necessary to qualify them for the highest Honour in Heaven, viz. of Faith and Repentance, p. 312. Because they are in Bad Company, and he that toucheth Pitch will be defil'd therewith.

Now, I think, I may fairly appeal to my Reader, whether my *May-not-be's* are not as good Arguments, as Mr. Dodwell's *May-be's*, and, indeed, I am asham'd to see a Man of so great Learning so bewilder'd in his Reasoning, as to talk of a *middle state for Souls*

in the Air from the Doctrines of exploded Heathen Philosophy, and erect Platonisme for Christianity, because the Writers of the Holy Scriptures, and the ancient Poets and Philosophers have jump'd in the same Expressions, pag. 248. He might as well have argued from St. Paul's quoting Aratus, τὸ θεὸν ὁμοιωσάμενος; That the Apostle learn'd his Divinity or Knowledge of God's creating Man from Aratus the Greek Poet. All which absurd Notions about a middle state, and Receptacle of the Souls of Deceas'd, I look upon to proceed meerly from the Opinion of Men believing the Soul to be a spiritual Substance united to the Body, as generally taught by all Heathen, especially Platonic, Philosophers.

The next Head of Discourse relates to the *Universality of Punishments*, as it includes *Heathens* also to be brought to Judgment at the last Day, and this account I take to be properly ascrib'd to the *Justice of God*, and that he never gave them such a Nature, or such a *Mortal Soul*, as rendred them *totally perishable* i. e. never to be rais'd again from the Dead to give an Account of their Works, at the General Resurrection, if they never could hear of the Preaching of the Gospel. Mr. Dodwell infers right, when he says, *That the Scripture plainly supposes a great difference between the Punishment of them, who had never heard of the Gospel, and those who had heard of it,*

it, and rejected it, parag. 4. It is very true, I own, but it doth not necessarily thence follow, that Sinners, who never heard of the Gospel, shall have *no Punishment at all*? The Parallel Case is, that of the Servant *Luke 12: Who knew his Masters Will, but did it not, he was to be beaten with many Stripes, but he that knew it not, was to be beaten with some, tho' but few Stripes, v. 47. 48.* And as it follows, *to whom much is given, of him shall be much required. For the Scripture concludes All under Sin, Gal. 3. 22. tho', as to Rewards, the Believers have the preference, i. e. That the Promise of Faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe, ibid.* Now as the Portion of Punishment appears by the fore-mention'd Instances to be different and unequal in those who sinned *against*, and those who sinned *without Knowledge*, or ignorantly, so it is so *General* that it excuses none; and as *Damnation* is peculiarly annex'd to *Unbelievers*, so are other Sins of the greatest Dye. Sins certainly which Heathens, who never heard the Gospel, may be guilty of; as *Murderers, Whoremongers, Sorcerers, Idolaters, Lyers*, Rev. 21. v. 8. But, says Mr. Dodwell, these other Criminals are added there, to shew, that even the Profession of the true Communion, will not secure Persons guilty of such flagitious Sins from the Portion of Unbelievers, parag. 5. if they add not farther Care of securing them-

Selves by Repentance. And pray, if *Heathens* are such Sinners, (as it is too notorious *some* were) do They not *require care* also to secure to themselves Immortality of happiness after Death ? It is very plain by all the Writings of good *Heathens*, that, to deter Men from Vice, and encourage them to Virtue, they threatned *Tartarum*, Hell, where Sinners underwent intolerable Torments by various ways, and on the contrary, to promise to the Good and Virtuous, an *Elysium* and *Tempe*, and all the Delights and Pleasures they imagin'd to be most *Grateful* and *acceptable* to them in this World, that they should enjoy the same in the next. Therefore it cannot but be highly consequent to Infinite Justice to punish the Offending Abominable *Heathens* with Punishments of the same Nature, tho' not to the same Degree of Unbelievers. For as there are Degrees of Glory in Heaven, so there are Degrees of Punishments in Hell, but whether any shall be *Eternal*, I will not presume *positively to determine*, nor say any more than what I have already endeavour'd to prove it consistent with the Nature of *Infinite Justice*, so to Act, if He pleases.

The *Jews* Mr. *Dodwell* thinks liable to perpetual Punishments, tho' they never heard of the Gospel, because they were entituled to the *Spirit in Reversion*, and so might be *Intituled*

intituled to the Consequences of it, tho' they lived before the Gospel, parag. 3. Certainly if unknowing Heathens were excusable by reason of their Ignorance, undoubtedly Unknowing Jews must have the same Benefit, tho' they are really intituled to the Spirit in Reversion; That odd sort of Title, as well as Expression. For what signifies it to have a Title [to any Estate, suppose] unless you know, that you have that Title inherent in you, and can make it out? Can any Man be supposed justly to forfeit an Estate, if he did not Know he had a Title to it? These are such wild Suppositions, that I cannot but admire to hear of them from so Great, and so Learned a Man. For put the Case Mr. C—k has a Title to a Bp—ck, and that he has not Skill enough to examine into his Title, according to the Methods of the Law, but yet tries what methods he thinks best to attain it, and at last sits down after all his pains and search acquiescing, that he knows of no Title he has, or can find out, shall he therefore deserve any Punishment because he had a Title to a Bp—ck. Thus it must be suppos'd to happen to many Ignorant Jews, who if they had a Title to this Immortalizing Spirit, under the Gospel, they did not know it, nay, never could have found out the same, I verily believe, unless they had liv'd so long, as to this present Age, and consulted that Learned

Gentleman also. Besides, tho' I may have a Title to an *Estate in Reversion*, 'tis very uncouth to talk of a *Title to a Spirit in Reversion*, especially where so slender Proofs are made of the Existence of that *Immortalizing Spirit united with the Mortal Soul of Man*. But concerning this else where——

Besides, the *Universality of Punishment* prov'd from the *Universality of Sinners*, the Scripture asserts the same by General Words, or Words importing a General Signification. *As the Hour is coming in which All that are in the Graves shall hear his Voice, and shall come forth; They that have done Good to the Resurrection of Life, and They that have done Evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation, John 28. v. 29.* As to this Text Mr. D—— gives an Answer devis'd in General, *That there is no reason to understand Them, as intended by our Saviour himself to mean Universally; or if our Saviour had so meant, he had a Salvo against that also, They might have been admitted to the Favour of having been preach'd to, in their Separate State.* For it is usual in those *Eastern Countries*, to use these large Expressions, when they mean no more then was requisite for the Occasion on which they use them, parag. 6. Now if a Man could make this Answer reasonably true, all the General Expressions in the Bible might be reduc'd to Particulars, from *Genesis* to the *Revelations* of

of St. John. The General Deluge must be Partial, and iho' All Flesh died that mov'd upon the Earth, Gen. 7. 21. All, in whose Nostrils was the Breath of Life, 22. Every Living Substance, 23. that was capable of being drown'd by the overflowing of the Waters. And so in several other Places too tedious here to insert. But farther, St. Paul says, As by the Offence of One, Judgment came upon All Men, πάντας ἀνθρώπους to Condemnation: So by the Righteousness of One, the Free Gift came upon all Men εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους to Justification of Life, rendred εἰς δικαίωσιν Ζῆς. And again, As by one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin; so Death passed upon All Men; for that All have Sinned, v. 12. I know Mr. Dodwell excuses the Generality of the Fact by ἐπ' ὃ πάντες in whom All sinned, meaning in Adam; that is, after the similitude of Adam, who was charg'd as being a Personal Transgressor, and his Posterity after, as involv'd in the Patriarchal Covenants, paragr. 32. And says He again, The Word All in the former Text ought to refer to those who accept of the Gospel upon hearing it Preach'd, paragr. 33. For it is most certain, that All individual Men have not the Benefit of actual Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, in the same latitude as w herein the Word is taken, when They are said

to be liable to the Condemnatory Sentence for the Sin of Adam, *ibid.* p. 33. Now to prove such answers insufficient, I shall not endeavour a new Exposition of them, but refer to my Reader to consider why our Saviour declared it *to be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha, two Heathen Cities, in the Day of Judgment*, than for that City or Place, which shall reject the Gospel once offered to Them, as He does *Matth. x. v. 50.* relating to *Capernaum*, *ch. 11. v. 24.* Sure for our Saviour to tell his Disciples, that *it should be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha, &c implies* that the People of those Cities shall appear, or *stand in Judgment*, tho' they were wicked *Heathen Cities*, and knew nothing of the Gospel. Again, what think you of the *Queen of the South, and the Men of Nineveh rising up in Judgment*, *Luke 11. v. 32.* against the Scribes and Pharisees, who refus'd to receive His Gospel? Certain the *Rising up in Judgment against them*, must mean to confront them at the Day of a General Judgment, and show their Obstinacy, that they would not repent at the Preaching of his Doctrines, when the *Ninevites* did at the Preaching of *Jonas*. For the comparative Dispute could not be between the *Ninevites*, and the Jews of that present Age, when our Saviour Preach'd to them; because it refers to the Times of *Jonas* the Prophet,

phet, who liv'd long before our Saviour, and consequently it must relate to a Time when Both shall appear Face to Face to confront each, and have the Heinousness of their Crimes urg'd against them, in Comparison of *Heathens* and *Idolaters*; which, I take only to be question'd at the *Day of a General Judgment*, unless Mr D—— will give room for the Contest in his *Hades of the Air*, and Convert the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* guilty of those Enormous Crimes, in that State by *Preaching to them the Doctrines of Faith and Repentance*, nay, conferring on them *Baptism in that Station also*.

Thus, I hope, I have made good my first General Proposition, That Man, or the Soul of Man, cannot be actually Immortaliz'd to Punishment by the *Pleasure*, but the *Justice* of God: And, that if *Man* suffer *Eternal Torments* for Sins, it is reconcilable rather to the *Justice*, than the *Pleasure of God*, and ought to be *thereunto* upon better Grounds ascrib'd. That Foolish Devise of an Hades in the Air, which is pure Platonisme, or an Heathen Doctrine, I look on to be so *Ridiculous*, that it deserves no Confutation, by way of serious Argumentation; but if it happen in my way *casually*, perhaps I may touch upon it. That the *Universality of Sin* implies an *Universality of Judgment at the last Day*, I presume I have as fully prov'd, as so
short,

short an Epistle would permit me, and I should be glad some more Learn'd Pen than mine wou'd, if it be possible, set the matter of this Controversy aright, and not leave Mankind dubious thus about the *Mortality of the Soul*, or *Immortality*; I mean, first State, and make it plainly from Scriptures, if possible, that it is something more than *Breath of Life*, and then talk of its *Immortality* in Scripture Language, and not in meer Platonism. The next Thing I propose to discuss, is, my second general Proposition.

2. *That the Divine Baptismal Spirit, is not that Power which Immortalizes Man; but only a Conditional Grace requisite to gain Immortality of Happiness by.*

As to the *Union of a Divine Baptismal Spirit with the Soul*, a Mortal Principle, or as Mr. Dodwell elsewhere calls it, *A Principle indifferent in it self to Mortality or Immortality*, I must confess I have no adequate Idea of such an Union, for I cannot suppose that that Gentleman means, that the *Holy Ghost*, as the third Person in the Trinity, is United *Personally* to every Man, in order to Immortalize Him. This were to make every Christian to be *God and Man*, with a thousand more absurd Consequences. There-
fo re

fore He must only mean a *Divine Inspiration*, or *Gift*, as *St. Paul* calls it, *Act* 2. 28. convey'd by the *Holy Ghost* at *Baptism*, by means of which *Gift* a *Christian* is perpetuated to endure endless *Torments*, or enjoy eternal *Happiness*. Parallel to this is the *Gift of the Holy Ghost* poured out upon the *Gentiles*, mention'd, *Acts* 10. 45. to *Acts* 11. v. 17. Of which *Gifts* there are *Diversities*, but by the same *Spirit*, and there are differences of *Administrations*, but the same *Lord*; and there are *Diversities* of *Operations*, but it is the same *God*, 1 *Cor.* ch. xii. v. 4, 5, 6. Now that this *Gift of the Holy Ghost* adds no new *Nature* to *Man*, as a constituent Principle, to *Mortalize* or *Immortalize* Him, but was only looked on as a *Conditional Grace*, in order to procure *Eternal Salvation* by, is easily collected from the *Texts* above-mentioned, *Acts* 2. *St. Peter* says, *Repent, and be Baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost*, v. 38. above-mentioned. So when the *Holy Ghost* was poured out upon the *Gentiles*, v. 45. *St. Peter* presently adds, *Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be Baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we*, v. 47. For which reason the *Baptism* of *John* is called a *Baptism with Water*, and that by the *Apostles*, as instituted by our *Saviour*,

a *Baptizing with the Holy Ghost*, Acts 11. 16. Whereupon he further says, that *God gave also unto the Gentiles Repentance unto Life*, v. 18. From all which places, and several others I could mention, I presume it evidently appears, that the *Spirit* or *Spiritual Gift* given at Baptism, was no more than a *Conditional Grace* conferr'd on Man, in order to qualify him for *Eternal Happiness* as a Christian, being the plainest, surest, and safest way to Heaven. Not exclusive of all others, who are out of the possibility of receiving Baptism, as I will prove by and by, tho' the Words mention'd by Mr. Dodwell, Mat. 16. 16. are as general, as those relating to our *All dying in Adam*, parag. 31. In this Sense I take the Words of the Church Catechism, when it says in Baptism, *An Inward and Spiritual Grace, is given us as a means necessary to Salvation*, which means, both *Heathens* and *Jews* wanted; but it doth not therefore follow, they shall either return to their *Primitive non-existence*, or be instructed in the separate State, in order to *Salvation*. For, I pray, if *Heathens* or *Jews*, who never heard of the Gospel, do, or may exist in that separate state till the *Day of Judgment*, by what Power do they gain any Existence at all after Death, seeing their Souls are *Mortal*? Doth *God's Spirit* give them that Being, in order to convert them by

good

good Angels, by Faith, Preaching and Re-
 pentance in the Regions of the Air, where
 that middle state is appointed? This can-
 not be, because none but the Baptismal Spi-
 rit gives Life? Nor can it be done by the
Pleasure of God; because they that are there
 condemn'd to perpetual Punishment, are on-
 ly such as have heard of the Gospel, or have
 a *Title in Reversion* (as Mr. D—— calls it)
 to the Benefits and Consequences of the Gos-
 pel, and either rejected it, or would not
 make their claim to that Title Good. If such
 Souls are only Resident in that middle state,
 Good, Pious and Virtuous Heathens must
 therefore seek for a Power of their own ma-
 king, or finding out, if they would but at-
 tain to live in this middle separate State;
 but its hard that they must be forc'd to do
 so, seeing they found out the *Place* before
 ever any Christian or Jew heard of it. They
 may hope to be translated to an *Elysium*,
 where the Gods *Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες*,
shamefully cited with many more Expressions
 out of *Plato*, and some *Greek Poets*, to prove
 Christianity by, pag. 96. to pag. 100.) Re-
 vel, and delight themselves after Death, as
 it were, *Basking in Immortality*; but it is
 All in vain for either good Jews, or good
 Heathens to expect, tho' God our Saviour
 would have All Men to be sav'd, and come to
 the Knowledge of the Truth, 1 Tim. ch. 2. v. 3.

For

For, says Mr. Dodwell, they must dye, as the Beasts that perish, and they have no hopes to gain an Immortality even of *Damnation*, much less to have their Reward for the good Works done in the Flesh. But how inconsistent this is *with Infinite Justice*, I have already proved from Arguments of Reason, and the Authority of Scripture.

After the representation of *Nephesb*, *Ruach* and *Neshamah*, as Words denoted to correspond with the *Body*, *Soul* and *Spirit* in Scripture, too mean to be call'd an Argument to prove it so, because it is as *one, two and three*, He puts the Question, *What difference is there between the Platonical Notions, to those of the New Testament? But that the sacred Writers more frequently call that Πνεῦμα which the Platonists call Λόγος or Νῆς? The reason of that is manifest, because the Scripture ascribes that superior Power in a Man to a Divine Breathing, Gen. 2. 7. yet both Mortal, pag. 23. till a Θεῶν Πνεῦμα Immortaliz'd that superior Power or Soul. So when Souls are made ἱσάγγελοι by the addition of this Adscititious Spirit, they are then qualify'd, and not before, for the higher Degrees of Punishment, viz. With the Devil and his Angels, for whom Hell is prepar'd only, but they are not yet there, but their present Place is the Darknes that is nearest the Heavens, the Regions of Light, p. 31. And as Christians*

side

side with the Devil, and become his Partisans against Christ, and his Angels, who are in constant mutual Hostility, their Souls shall be adjudged to the same Place where the Devils now lie under Confinement reserved in Chains of Darkness, or Condemned to outer Darkness, *ibid.* All this they gain by having that Adscititious Spirit Πνεῦμα Θεῖον superadded to their Natures, called the Divine Baptismal Spirit united to their Souls, pag. 29, 30, 31. What now? What have we an Adscititious Spirit to qualify the Souls for Punishment also? I thought they were Immortaliz'd by the Pleasure of God just before to Punishments? No, that is not all it seems. But this Qualification to higher Degrees of Punishment (a most Excellent Qualification indeed!) can only concern those Souls, whose Nature had been Exalted and Improved by the Accession of this Adscititious Spirit, as deriv'd to them in Baptism, or convey'd in Reversion; others were not ἰσάγγελοι in Nature, and therefore not so qualify'd to share in the Punishment of lapsed Angels, parag. 8.

Was there ever such a Medley of Doctrines broach'd in a Christian World? Or was ever Paganism quoted before to establish the Fundamentals of Christianity? The Arguments of Heathens may be us'd confirmatory of Christianity, but I hope we have surer Foundations to build Christianity it self on. And
all

all this done, to find out a way, or some Principle or other, to *Immortalize the Soul of Man*, least Offence should be given to question its Immortality, so that a Thousand ridiculous Opinions must be extorted from Scripture and Philosophy, for a Justification of our *Souls Immortality*, or else the Current of the Age will be displeas'd with us, when as not one Argument that I find in all this whole Book relates to the *Souls Immortality*, *abstractedly* considered, but to *Man's Immortality* under several Denominations: As call'd sometimes the *Earthly Man*, and sometimes the *Spiritual Man*, the *Natural Man*, the *Worldly Man*, the *Heavenly Man*, all still relating to the *same Man*, in respect of *his Composition*, tho' He receives different Denominations from the Qualifications He is endow'd with. When the Apostle speaks, *Rom. 7.* of the Law being *Spiritual*, that it killed him, being a *Carnal Man*, and *that when the Commandment came, Sin reviv'd, and He died, v. 9.* call'd the *Body of Death, v. 24.* Can any Man imagine *St. Paul* to have been two Men, *i. e.* a *Living Man without the Law*, and a *Dead Man under the Law*? Sure I am, none can be so foolish, as to imagine this distinction necessary or Requisite, though I fear I shou'd find many such Grounds of Argumentation in *Mr. Dodwell's Book*, would my Time and

Pati-

patience permit me to scan over every particular Argument. But I will now only proceed to prove, as I promis'd, *That Men in General, according to the Tenour of the Holy Scriptures, were ordain'd to perpetual Happiness or Misery; and that those who receiv'd the Benefit of Baptism, call'd an Union of the Soul with a Baptismal Spirit, have no new Substance or Power superadded to their Natures by which they are Immortaliz'd, but that God by his sole omnipotent Power Immortalizes every Man, either before, or after a General Resurrection, in order to receive the Recompence of his Good or Bad Deeds done whilst He liv'd in the World.*

As to the Authority of the Fathers, and Primitive Christians of the Church, I have delivered my Sentiments already, and if they had *All* declar'd it their Opinion, that Man was *wholly Mortal*, without troubling the World about the inexplicable Nature of the *Soul*, as to its Essence, I think they would have taught us true Doctrine. Not that I therefore should have embrac'd it, because the *Primitive Fathers*, or *Primitive Mothers*, had said it, but because I look upon it to be a *Doctrine Consonant to Reason, and Reveal'd Religion, and that no other Doctrine can be made so in relation to Living Man*, notwithstanding this new erected Scheme of *Immortalization by an Adscititious Spirit,*

K

and

and *Præternatural Principle* in Baptism. But amongst other Texts of Scripture, cited by Mr. Dodwell, to prove the *Mortality of the Soul* (not drawn from *πνὴ*, and *ψνεῶμα* two Words sometimes apply'd *promiscuously* for one and the same Thing, and sometimes *differently* for two distinct Things) I Wonder that he did not cite that of the Apostle in 1 Cor. 15. Chap. especially seeing he is very Argumentative about the *εἰκὼν* of God, mention'd in the same Chapter. The Words are these, and seem to be of force in the Original, tho' not in the Translation? Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτίζομενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ ἐκ ἐγείρεσθαι, v. 29. The Translation is thus. *Else what shall They do, which are Baptiz'd for the Dead, if the Dead rise not at all.* But it ought to be, if they that are wholly dead, (*totaliter mortui*, speaking of Persons, not Carcases, and the Word ὅλως is conjoin'd with νεκροὶ not ἐγείρεσθαι) are not rais'd to Life again! And the Deduction is conclusive enough: If All that made up Man be rais'd, All that made up his Composition, when Living, died certainly, for Resurrection to Life necessarily implies that the Thing was *totally dead, which is totally reviv'd*, which can never be said of a Being *Naturally Immortal*. Nor will the common shift of saying, *Man is totally dead, if his Soul be separated from his Body*, avail; because r.

in Fact, it is not so, for the *Body* only is supposed *Dead*, and not the *Soul*, which is but Man's dying *partially*, or in one half — As our *Heathen* Poets express themselves, — *Parte mei meliore supertes* — 2. Because, if so understood, it could not be an Argument cogent enough to prove the Resurrection, as is there intended. For the Question is not about the Resurrection of the Bodies, τὰ Σώματα, but the *Persons* οἱ νεκροί and so in several other Places of this Chapter, nay, I think, I may say, all the *whole Bible* over still in the Masculine Gender: Again, the Apostle was to confute the *Pharisees*, as well as the *Sadduces*, I mean, to make his Argument good against those who held there was *Angels and Spirits*, as well as those who held neither: Now the Concession to the latter, was in order to proof — Suppose Man dies *wholly* [Body and Soul] yet He shall be *wholly* rais'd again, else ye are very unwise to Baptise for the Dead, if you expect not a Resurrection, or Revivification of the *Whole Man*. Here the *Sadduces* must be silent, and satisfied, but not so the *Pharisees*, because they that taught, and believ'd the *Soul* a *Spiritual Substance naturally Immortal*, and immediately received into *Happiness or Misery*, after Death, could not be sensible of the Efficacy of such an Argument, because they might reply, what sig-

nifies it whether ' *This Lump of Earth, this*
 ' *Dead Carcass, and but a Prison of the Soul,*
 ' rise, or not, our *Souls* go at our Deaths *into*
 ' *Immediate Happiness, or Misery, and are*
 ' capable of enjoying both to the utmost per-
 ' fection, without the *Clog of the Body*: 'Tis
 ' true, if the *Body shall rise* again at a Gene-
 ' ral Resurrection, 'tis more than we Know,
 ' or Believe, but there seems *no necessity* for
 ' it, in respect of Enjoyment of Happiness,
 ' or Misery. Therefore we don't *Baptize, or*
 ' *wash the Living Body,* in hopes that the
 ' *Dead Body* shall be rais'd, but we Baptize
 ' the *Living Person* in hopes our *dead Friend*
 ' shall, *by the benefit of such Washing,* be rais'd
 ' to a Living Person again, or qualify'd for
 ' the State of a Resurrection to Life ever-
 ' lasting. This is the natural Reasoning from
 the Words, and would much derogate from
 the force of the Apostle's Argument, if it
 did not prove the *Necessity of a Resurrection*
of the ὅλως νεκρῶν. Besides, I do not find
 that it ever was question'd or debated, whe-
 ther the *Body,* consider'd *abstractedly,* was,
 or could be rais'd from the Dead; for all *Hea-*
thens look'd upon it as *impossible or ridicu-*
lous, and therefore the *Greeks, who sought af-*
ter Knowledge, knowing this Distinction of
Soul and Body into two Substantial Parts, laugh'd
 when they heard St. Paul talk of a Resurrecti-
 on of our Bodies, undoubtedly consider'd, in
 their

their meaning, for St. Paul, nor they could never mean a Resurrection of *A Soul*, which could never die; because that also might have deserv'd *Laughter* too. Wherefore St. Paul in all his Reasoning about the *Resurrection* makes no distinction of *Bodies* being rais'd, but speaks always *Personal*, when he argues of the Resurrection, as ἀναστασιν μέλλειν ἐσεῖναι νεκρῶν, *Dead Persons*, because it immediately follows, δίκαιον τε, καὶ ἀδίκων of the Just and Unjust, two Attributes which can never be ascrib'd to *Body abstractedly* consider'd, Acts 24. v. 15. So in the whole current of the 15th Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, we find νεκρῶν to mean *Persons*, and therefore St. Paul might, upon a double Account, call them *Fools*, 1 Cor. 15. 36. Who should put so ridiculous a Question, as, *With what Bodies do the Bodies of the Dead come?* v. 35. no, it is Πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί; *How are dead Persons rais'd at the last Day?* What kind of Body will they, who are so rais'd up from the Dead, be endow'd with? A *Glorify'd*, or not *Glorify'd*, *Natural* or *Spiritual Body*, v. 44. And the Difficulty is wholly resolv'd into the Omnipotence of God, *Who gives them such a Body as pleases Him*, v. 38. where the Word *Body* denotes not a Bulk of *Flesh* modify'd into *Human Shape*, but a *Comprehension* of the *Whole Man*, as once a *Living Creature*, so express'd

press'd *Mat. 27. 52. When many Bodies of the Saints arose, and entred (not abstracted from Souls unquestionably) into the Holy City.* But to proceed to my first Design.

If Man therefore, be *wholly Mortal*, the Question is, whether none but who are Baptiz'd are capable of being Immortaliz'd? For all Parties, tho' they disagree in the Nature of *Soul*, own *Men* will be Immortaliz'd after the Resurrection, tho' Mr. *Dodwell* supposes none but those *entitled to*, or endow'd with, a *Baptismal Spirit*. I presume I have made it appear, that by *Baptismal Spirit*, must be meant, some supernatural *Gift of the Holy Ghost*, and not the *Holy Ghost personally* united to this mortal Principle, the *Soul*, to Immortalize the same: If so, Baptism can be no more than a *necessary Condition* to gain Immortality by in the Christian Church, and so it seems in the Sense of the Church of *England* before cited, and of the Scriptures also. Nay, not only Baptism is made a Condition, but also *Faith* and *Repentance*, are other Conditions to make it truly a Christian Baptism, as *Mark, He that believeth, and is Baptiz'd, shall be sav'd*, ch. 16. v. 16. where Faith in Christ is to precede. Again, *Repent, and be Baptiz'd*, Acts 2. 38. Here *Repentance* is made requisite to a valid Baptism, *vid. Acts 18. v. 8.* Now, no Man sure will call a Condition, an *Immortalizing Spirit*,

or Power, which can give Immortality. You may as well say, *Faith* and *Repentance* are two *Immortalizing Spirits* also. By one Spirit, [meaning the Holy Ghost] we are all *Baptiz'd into one Body* [of Christ] whether Jews or Gentiles, *Bond or Free*, 1 Cor. xij. 13. says St. Paul, in the very same Chapter discoursing of the different *Spiritual Gifts* of the Holy Ghost. But I do not find thereby that we put on *Immortality*, but only are thereby admitted into the Pale of the Christian Church, under certain *Means* and *Conditions* to obtain everlasting Happiness by. It is observ'd by Mr. Dodwell, pag. 20. That God granted St. Paul, *All that sail'd with him*, Acts 27. 24. yet on Condition that they *All would abide in the ship*. Now, who can make this Condition the Cause of their being sav'd? You may make it the *means*, which God had ordain'd, in order to save them from being drown'd, but God himself was the Cause of their protection and safe-guard. It was his Almighty Power that preserv'd the Ship in that violent Storm, and his Guidance to rely on Him for Salvation, in the Way he had before directed and commanded, that secured them. Thus when we talk of an *Immortalizing Spirit*, we must mean, some efficacious Cause which superadds an active Principle or Power it had not before, by which a mortal Nature is actually *Immortaliz'd* by the

Effects of its Union, if I understand Mr. Dodwell aright, not an *Occasional Cause*, as I may call it, or a *Conditional means* to work in us such a *preternatural Principle*, or spiritualiz'd Nature; no more than if I bid a Man avoid such a Road, and choose such a Road, and He will Travel safe, is the Cause of his *safety*; but 'tis his own activeness of Body, with a judicious Choice, that made him avoid Danger, and obtain Safety by my Directions. Moreover, to pretend an *Union of an Immortalizing Principle* to a *Distinct Soul*, from the Words—— *The Light which cometh into the World*, out of St. John, 1 ch. 9. or from the εἰκὼν, the *Image of the Earthly*, and the *Image of the Heavenly*, 1 Cor. 15. v. 49. is an uncouth way of Arguing, because that (as my Old Friend Dr. J. Turner rightly observes) *not relates to Soul*, but to *Man*. Therefore I think it not worth while to unravel this Controversy upon the word εἰκὼν, only I will add thus much, that as the *Image of God*, in which He made *Man* at the first Creation, Gen. 1. is agreed on by all Expositors to relate to *Man's Reason, Will and Understanding*, the highest and most perfect Faculties of Human Nature, by which He most nearly resembles God. So that *Image* here, 1 Cor. 15. seems to relate to the same purpose, inasmuch as Man shall be endow'd with far Greater and Higher super-natural Powers,

Powers, or Faculties, than ever he had, after the Resurrection, express'd by the *Difference of Glories*, v. 41. by *Spiritualiz'd Natures*, v. 44. by *Immortality*, v. 53. and all Things that may make us still more to resemble the Likeness of God, than ever, by such great additional Perfections.

Now to shew you, That *All Mankind in General* were at the first Creation of the World ordain'd to be Immortaliz'd to Happiness, or Misery; I shall in the next place endeavour to prove from Scriptures, and the Nature of Infinite Justice. It is an undoubted Maxim of Truth, That *Moral Obligations are perpetual*, and therefore call'd, *The Law which our Saviour came not to destroy, but to fulfill*, Mat. 5. v. 17. And if so, by Consequence, the *Transgressions of this Moral Law, or Obedience to it*, must be coævous with it, at least, very little space after its first implantation by God himself, in the Natures of Men, tho' not by a positive Institution promulg'd. St. Paul seems pretty plain in this case, when the Gentiles which have not the Law, do by Nature the Things contain'd in the Law, these not having the Law, are a Law unto themselves, which shew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts, their Consciences also bearing Witness, and their Thoughts the mean while either Excusing, or Accusing them. Rom. 2. v. 14, 15. Thus it

is plain, there may be a Transgression against the Laws of Nature, for which every one is liable to Punishment. Now that *Heathens* or *Jews*, who could never hear of the Gospel, are liable to the *same Punishment*, as those who have heard and rejected it, tho' not to the *same degrees of Punishment*, seems every way consonant to Scripture, because I verily believe, *To whom Little is given, of Him Little will be requir'd*, and God always accepts of a *Willing Mind*, according to that a *Man hath*, and not according to what a *Man hath not*, 2. Cor. 8. v. 12. So that as the Punishment of these Men shall be less, so will their Rewards be less, than those concern'd in the Gospel-Obedience. It is plain by the Tenour of Scripture, that there are Degrees of *Glory* in Heaven, and Degrees of Punishment in Hell, intimated by *few Stripes*, so that neither *Heathens* or *Jews* can hope for the *Benefit of Actual Mortality*: For we must All appear [without Limitation] before the Judgment Seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the *Things done in his Body*, according to that he hath done, whether it be Good or Bad, 2 Cor. 5. 10. Judgment, indeed, may begin at the House of God, against Those who obey not the Gospel of God, but end with other *Ungodly* and *Sinners* of all Nations, who must then appear also, 1 Pet. 4. 17. 18. It is said, as St. Paul reason'd of Judgment to
come

come, &c. *Felix*, a Roman, *trembl'd*, *Acts*, 24. 25. Surely he trembl'd not, as Mr. *Dodwell* would insinuate, because he found Christianity so dangerous a Profession to embrace, as to immortalize him to Misery, if he rejected it at St. *Paul's* Preaching. For He seem'd to slight his Reasoning; and most likely he was guilty of some notorious Crime or other, perhaps, of many, and the Consciousness of his Guilt, that he should, at a General Judgment, be call'd to an Account for it, which Judgment he never dreamt, of made him *Tremble*: Besides, we do not read one Word about the Nature of Baptism, where the Immortalizing Spirit is required, inculcated to him at that time, so that Mr. *Dodwell's* reason seems groundless.

Again, the Nature of a General Judgment seems to require an *Universal Resurrection of all Mankind*; inasmuch, as it is call'd a *Tryal and Condemnation*. Now, there frequently happen many Things to be done, which require proof from *Witnesses*, and we cannot suppose all Acts of Good or Evil, to be done in the presence of Christians, who are to rise again. Many may be done in Heathen Countries by Christians Traveling through, or dealing with them, which Heathens may be Witnesses of those Good or Bad Deeds, as *viz.* Those done by the *Spaniards* in recovery of the *West Indies*, &c. tho'

tho' they never heard of a Gospel. Now, according to Mr. Dodwell's Doctrine, those Heathens shall never rise at the Day of Judgment, to Witness against a Notorious Sinner, which Opinion I think derogates from Infinite Justice. Not that God necessarily requires Witnesses, to discover and prove every Fact done in the Flesh, because He is Omniscient; but as He has reveal'd his Will to act so, in the method of executing Judgment at the last Day, like that of the Roman Justice, *to have the Accusers come Face to Face*, Acts 25. 16. We ought to believe, that He will so act. So Satan is call'd an *Accuser of the Brethren*, Revel. xii. 10. Who will stand in the Day of Judgment, and accuse Sinners. And the formality of the Judgment expressed by *things written in Books*. And I saw the Dead, Small and Great, stand before God: And the Books were open'd, and another Book was open'd, which was the Book of Life. And the Dead were judg'd of these Things which were written in the Books, according to their Works. And the Sea gave up her Dead which were in it. And Hell [the Grave] deliver'd up her Dead, which were in them, and they were judg'd every Man [not every Baptiz'd Man] according to His Works, Revel. xx. 13, 14. So that it seems to be one part of the Business of that great Day, to bring Evidence to prove the Justice of God in his deal-

ings with Mankind at the last day, which Mr. Dodwell, in many cases, makes impossible to be done.

Thus, I hope, I have clear'd the Point satisfactorily, upon the Foundation of *God's Justice, and the Universality of Transgression*, that the Judgment of God, at the last Day, must be *Universal*. I would go on farther to answer Him as to his *middle State of the Souls*; and *Christ's Preaching to the Spirits in Prison*, dragg'd (as I may say) into an Argumentation; but, indeed, it is attended with so many idle Circumstances, as, *The Baptizing of Spirits with Water in that state; the Teaching of them Faith and Repentance, amongst the Company of Devils; their Conversion to Christianity, by unknown ways and means; tho' they are allow'd to be Spirits, and must want Ears to hear, and Eyes to see, if we judge aright of them, tho' they are Preach'd to, and continually visited by Good Angels, &c.* I say, these ridiculous *Modifications of Spirits* (if I don't strain too hard for a fit Expression) would prompt me more into a Banter, than serious Argumentation about them, so that I purposedly forbear to insist on Discourfing about them at all. Leaving Man as I found Him, and the Holy Scriptures make Him, *A Creature wholly Mortal, but capable of Immortality by the Power of God, with, or without the Union of a Baptismal Spirit, if He*
pleases

pleases, according to Man's Original Creation, to circumstantiated, as I have above explain'd it.

Now I come to prove my last Proposition.

3. *That the Bishops are not the only Conveyers of this Immortalizing Baptismal Spirit, or Conditional Grace, as I call it—*

If it be meant, that *Bishops*, as a Superior Order distinct from *Priests*, are the *only Conveyers* of this Spirit, I cannot consent to the Truth of it. Because, by the Scriptures, *Priests*, *Elders* and *Bishops* seem very oft to be Synonymous, and bare one signification, and that Power which they derive *Jure Divino* to Ordination, seems to be deriv'd from them, *quatenus Priests*, not *quatenus Bishops*. Now, if the *Imposition of Hands by Elders* can convey Ordination, the same Power can convey the Baptismal Spirit, and consequently the Bishops cannot be the *only Conveyers* of this *Baptismal Spirit*, or *Conditional Grace*, *vid.* the Offices of Bishops, and Priests, and Elders, in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, with that of *St. Paul* to the *Acts*, ch. 20. v. 17. where the *Elders* *St. Paul* called together to meet at *Miletus*, are such, *To whom he gives charge to feed the Flock, over whom the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers or Bishops*, as it ought to be Translated. Who had that Power

Power of Ordination in them. For that a Bishop only does it in our Nation, is an Argument grounded on the Civil Power, who will permit no other to do it here, not that it proves *Ordination* Sinful, or Unlawful, if it were done otherwise, *i. e.* that is, by laying on of the Hands of several Priests, Elders or Presbyters. This seems to me undeniably evident, from the Authority of Ancient Fathers, and the Holy Scriptures themselves, which frequently make the Bishop and Priest to be the same Order, as St. Paul, in divers of his Epistles, intimates; which serves to prove, that this Power of dispersing the Word of God, and Administering the Sacraments, &c. conferr'd by *Ordination*, is really deriv'd from the Bishop, *quatenus* a Priest, and not as Bishop. And did the Canons and Constitutions of the Church, back'd by the Civil Power, give Authority to several Priests to *Ordain*, none, I presume, could call it *Unlawful*, or say, it was contrary to the Laws of God, only to avoid disorder in the Church, as some conjecture; the Civil Power, or rather the Ecclesiastical Power, formerly supported by the Civil, appropriated that Office to *one peculiar Priest*. For our Saviour, when he bid his Apostles and Disciples go and Preach to all Nations, &c. at the first erecting of a Christian Church upon the Faith, St. Peter confessed

effed, did not, as we read of, Constitute
 or Ordain any such Order of Men, as Bi-
 shops in the Church ; but their very Com-
 mission bespeaks them no more than what
 we now call *Priests*. And, perhaps, this was
 done, because the Church of Christ was then
 but in its Infancy, and wanted not that *su-
 pervising* or *over-looking*, as the Word *Bishop*
 imports, to reduce it into a regular Frame
 or Body, as afterwards necessity required.
 For, afterwards upon the Preaching of the
 Apostles, the Church of Christ growing nu-
 merous, and being united in one Holy Fel-
 lowship or Communion, consisting of a mul-
 tiplicity of Converts, the Disciples of Christ
 thought it then highly necessary to constitute
 Bishops, such as was *Timothy*, and others,
i. e. Such an Order of Men, as should *Over-
 look*, and *Supervise*, the Government of the
 Church, and prevent Heresies from creeping
 into it ; and, indeed, to regulate, as *Superin-
 tendants*, the whole OEconomy of Disci-
 pline in the Church ; so that in reality they
 seem to be no more than the *Prime Discipli-
 narian Governours of the Church*, quatenus Bi-
 shops, but as to their *Power of Preaching*,
giving Ordination, &c. It is deriv'd from the
Priest (as said just now) and not from the
 Bishop. This Authority is now executed
 in the Church by their Chancellors, Com-
 missioners, &c. who have no Power to Or-
 dain,

dain, because they are not *Priests*; but if
 they were, the Civil Power since the Refor-
 mation, and before, having otherwise limi-
 ted it, they cannot, nor ought not without
 leave, as our Constitution now is, to exer-
 cise that Power or Authority. Wherefore upon
 the whole I conclude, that *Priests* may Ordain
Priests, and *Elders* may Ordain also by Impo-
 sition of Hands, so it be done according to
 Methods deducible from the Holy Scriptures,
 or from the practice of the Primitive Chri-
 stians, where the Scriptures are silent. For,
 as to the form of Ordination we know it is
 wholly new, what is used in the Church of
England; but if it were not, may undoubt-
 edly be alter'd by the power of the Go-
 vernment or Church. *Which hath Power to*
decree Rules and Ceremonies and Authority in
Controversies of Faith, as it is express Art.
 20. of the 39 Articles. *Yet it is not lawful*
for the Church to Ordain any thing that is con-
trary to God's word Written, so besides the same
it ought not to enforce any thing to be believ'd
for Necessity of Salvation, *ibid.* Now all this
 interferes not with that controverted Princi-
 ple bellow'd out amongst many of the *Bishops*
being Bishops jure Divino, because they are
 really so, inasmuch as they were constituted
 by the Disciples of Christ, the chief Gover-
 nors, and Part of the Christian Church in
 General, and as far as they are, and may be
 said to be *Priests* invested with that Autho-
 rity,

rity, they derive a Divine right from the
 Apostles, and the Disciples of Christ. But
 if any one pretends, that Bishops are a di-
 stinct Order of Men *jure Divino*, superior
 as to his Commission of *Preaching, and*
Teaching all Nations, &c. I am very much to
 seek the Foundation of that Divine right
 then. Therefore it is said in the Articles of
 the Church above-mention'd, that the Au-
 thority of the Church cannot Ordain any
 thing *besides the same*, i.e. *Unwarranted by*
the Scriptures, and that no matters of Faith
 ought to be enforc'd, not grounded on the
 Authority of the Scriptures. The deducti-
 on which I shall make from these Expressions
 in the 20th Article above-recited is this,
 that be the *Bishops* of Divine right, or not,
 it is not here to be made a proper Contro-
 versy ; but it is plain, that nothing can be
 done by the power of the Church *contrary to,*
or besides God's written Word, so that *Epis-*
copal Ordination, or *Ordination by laying on*
of the Elders Hands, being not contrary to,
 or unwarranted by the Holy Scriptures, they
 may be Both done without Sin, if the Autho-
 rity of the present Government thought fit to
 direct either. And as *Ordination* restrain'd to
 the *Bishops* only, seems to be an Ordinance of
 the Church relating to no matter of Faith, it
 ought not to be enforc'd to be believ'd as ne-
 cessary to Salvation. Now what is not neces-
 ary

fary to Salvation, I look upon to be circumscrib'd in the Parts of the discipline of the Church, and consequently may be alter'd by the Civil Power, I mean, as to the manner of Exercising that Discipline, so it doth not alter the Fundamentals of the Doctrine, or interfere with the Word of God. As for Example, the Sacrament is a Divine Institution, and implies a Doctrine in it necessary to Salvation, but whether it shall be taken *Kneeling* or *Sitting*, being the *Circumstantials* of the thing Instituted, the Civil Power may direct *lawfully*, I conceive, because it is couch'd, and circumscrib'd under the *Discipline of the Church*. Thus Ordination, tho' it confer a Sacred Power to Exercise a Ministerial Function not dependant on the Civil, yet whether it may be done *by laying on of the Hands of Elders*, or by *Bishops*, or *Priests* not being Bishops, if a Government so thought fit, may, by the Civil Power only, be determin'd. For in this case the Civil Power is but the *Director of Discipline*, and the *Priest* still the *Ordinator*, or, That Person or Persons, who derives His Sacred Authority from Christ of *Preaching, Teaching* and *Administration* of the *Sacraments*.

Thus have I answer'd, I hope, the bulk of Mr Dodwell's Argumentation, tho' not each Paragraph, as the way of some is, and prov'd that the *Immortalizing Spirit* must be a De-

vice of his own, and not well grounded on the Authority of Scripture to perpetuate *Human Nature* ; But that *Man*, not any *Distinct Soul* will be *Immortaliz'd* by Christ's Merits in the Christian Church, and out of it according to Rules adapted to the satisfaction concerning the *Philosophic and Scriptural state of the Dead*. I will next briefly treat, and ask pardon of every one, if I have used any Expression too *Indecent* or *Rude*, except those who have so used me. And as for the Order, or Authority of the Bishops to be *jure Divino*, I look upon it to be prov'd better by that I have said, *viz.* By making them part of the Apostolic Church originally Constituted, than by endeavouring to prove them A *jure Divino* distinct Order, and derive their Divine right from their Episcopacy.

Having thus now gone through the substance of the Book, I come to examine Mr. *Bodwell's* Advice to Dissenters, to come and unite themselves under their respective Diocessans, in order to be made capable of Immortality of Happiness. For, as none could convey this Immortalizing Spirit, in order to its Baptismal Union with the Soul, but the Bishops; so according to his Notion, all Dissenters are in a most dangerous and deplorable State, unless they recur to the Episcopacy, as their sure conductors to Heaven. If this

Charge

Charge was really true, it behov'd them all undoubtedly to study a speedy reconciliation to those pious Fathers of the Church, that can give them this sure *Vaticum* to Heaven. And supposing this to extend to several *Dissenters*, what shall we do with those call'd *Anabaptists*? They must be such a sort of Persons before they come to Years of Discretion to be Baptiz'd, That, as to their Souls, there is no place or Residence in the whole Universe left for them after Death, no, not even the *Hades* above or below. For as they are Members of Christ's Church, being born in it, they embrace his Doctrines, and believe his Gospel to be true, which one would think should entitle them to Immortality of Happiness. O! no, says Mr. *Dodwell*, as they never had that Divine *Immortalizing Spirit in Baptism* united to their Souls (supposing they dye before they are able to answer for themselves, or know what Faith and Repentance is) so they can never hope to gain Immortality of Happiness without it. Now this on the other hand looks but odd neither, That they who receive the Gospel, embrace it as the Word of God, Live up to it in their Lives and Conversation, believe it to be the sure Guide, a *Light to their Paths*, and a *Lanthorn to their Feet*, as Holy David expresses it, yet that They should be deny'd Heaven, because they disagree not in the

L 3

Thing.

Thing, but in the Time of Adminiftring that Baptifm, looks very fevere ; and it cannot be deny'd alfo, but they may be at fuch years of Difcretion, as to be capable of knowing Good and Evil, and alfo of chufing the Good, and refufing the Evil, which implies emphatically *Option*, by which means one would think they had a good Title to Heavenly Duration, or Immortal Happinefs. No; again, fays Mr. *Dodwell*, all this avails nothing, live never fo Righteoufly or Godly, without this *Union of the Divine Baptifmal Spirit*, nothing can be done. They may, indeed, be *Baptiz'd with Water*, and the *Holy Ghost* in the Hades of the Air, and fo retrieve their Immortality to Happinefs by *that*, and the Converfation and Protection of Good Angels Preaching unto them, and continually protecting them.

But then I ask, how fhall *the Souls of fuch Men get even thither*? They have no right to Live again in any State, unlefs determin'd by the *Pleasure of God* to live in misery, or by the *Union of the Baptifmal Spirit*, to live in Happinefs Eternally. The firft of which feems wholly inconsistent with the infinite Juftice of God, becaufe I fuppofe them every way Good and Righteous, conformable in All points of the Gospel, as the Exposition of that Gospel appears to them by the Evidence of their Senfe and Reason ; therefore

we cannot suppose them to be liable to *Eternal Damnation*, and the want of the latter Qualification, viz. the *Baptismal Spirit* deprives them of *Eternal Salvation*. Now, if they cannot be *Immortal* as to *Punishments*, nor *Immortal* as to *Rewards*, nor yet obtain any visible passage from the Grave by any *Supernatural Power* to translate them into the *Upper Regions of the Air*, to endow them with such fine and noble Qualifications as are there Taught, and Preach'd to Souls, there is but one shift more, and there is an end of 'em at once, viz. *To enjoy the Benefit of their Primitive Mortality*, or dye, and never be raised to Life again, tho' this cannot well be granted neither : For, as they are professed Christians, and born within the Church of Christ, they must have some Title, in *Reversion* at least, to this *Baptismal Spirit*, and consequently can have no claim to the *Benefit of their Original Mortality*. What shall we do now with these Men ? Truly, in my Opinion, Mr. Dodwell ought in Conscience to provide some place or other, as a *Receptacle of the Souls* of these Men after Death, and not leave them in so uncertain a State, as they must be in, according to his Notion, as not to be able to *Live* or *Dye* at all, to have, or not have, a *Duration* after this Life, notwithstanding they must be qualify'd for some State or other in the

L 4

World,

World, as much as other Men. Sure I am therefore that his Notion must be weak, and ill grounded, as it is ill express'd, by an *Intended Substantial Union of the Divine Baptismal Spirit with the Substance of the Soul*. If He, or, any one else, will talk of an *Union* that is *intelligible*, I would desire them, and other *Dissenters*, if it were feasible, to become *United* with Those, now call'd the *Church of England*, in order to a True National Good, which will be beyond his Metaphysical Union in Words.

For as to an Union with the *Anabaptists*, if *Infant-Baptism* be the *only Obstacle* that keeps them out from the Pale of the Church of *England*, I cannot say, but that the Church seems to be in the wrong, not to receive them *their own way*, viz. To Baptize them in the Church of riper Years, without the Sign of the Cross; or Godfathers, or the like Ceremonials. For I cannot satisfy myself, why that reason which gives an Account of *Sureties performing the Conditions of Faith, and Repentance for Infants Baptiz'd*, as mention'd in the Church Catechism, should ever pass so glibly down amongst all Church-men without Examination, whether it be a good Reason, or no. The Questions are these,

Question. What is requir'd of Persons to be Baptiz'd?

Answer.

Answ. *Repentance*; whereby they forsake Sin; And *Faith*, whereby They stedfastly believe the Promises of God made to Them in this Sacrament.

Question. Why are *Infants* then Baptiz'd, when by reason of their tender Age they cannot perform them?

Answ. Because they promise Them both by their *Sureties*, which Promise, when They come to Age, They themselves are bound to perform.

This Reason of the Church I take to be very weak and insufficient; tho' I am of Opinion, that Infants ought to be Baptiz'd, and the Arguments *quatenus ad Homines*, so far as they are brought against Churchmen, seem to me to be on the *Anabaptists* side, if you consider this Reason of the Church, and not the Thing, as it is an Ordination of Christ indefinitely to Baptize All Nations, wherein Infants must reasonably be suppos'd to make a part. For how can *Infants* (suppose of 8 Days old) promise? What Obligation do's the *Promise of Sureties* lay on Infants? Certainly it is impossible to be reconcil'd to common Reason one way or other. Suppose, for Example, a *Mahometan* of about 25 Years old, should be taken with a *Dead Palfie*, whereby he accidentally becomes deaf and dumb, and his Memory grows totally impair'd, which is equivalent

as

as to the state of an Infant 8 or 10 Days old in respect of Understanding. If the Priest, zealous of a Convert, should baptize such a Man with *Sureties*, who engage that if He ever recover'd his Senses, He should turn Christian, must He necessarily be so upon recovery? I very much question any such Ceremonial Obligation, and, perhaps, He would say, as frequently to our Shame they do on other Occasions; *What do you think I am bound to be a Christian, to Swear, Cheat and Lye, as Christians do? No, it is impossible, I that had no Power to consent to any thing, when Ill, could not promise to perform the Covenants of Faith and Repentance, nor am I bound to stand to the Sureties voluntary Promise for me. For, upon consideration, now I am able to judge of it, I like my own Religion better, wherefore my Promise must be necessarily void, and theirs frivolous and vain.* This would be the Language of a *Mahometan*, and a very Rational Argumentation too, founded on undeniable Truth, viz. *That no Man can be oblig'd to do an Impossibility.* Now in that state it is as much impossible, that an Infant should promise Obedience to the Covenants of Faith and Repentance, as it is that the Voluntary Promise of *Sureties* should bind him, when he comes to Age. The Church, indeed, may interpret it the consent of Infants, when they are Baptiz'd in the presence of *Sureties*, but the Reason

Reason thereof is to me as unscrutable, as if they should interpret the *Crying at the Font* (as many Children do) its *certain rejoycing* to be initiated a Member of Christ's Church. Therefore if I were thought worthy to advise, I should think this Reason, with *some Ceremonial Pomp* in Baptism, ought to be amended. But *reform some Churchmen*, He that can, the very Word *Reformation* seems so harsh to them, that it will be an high Provocation to say the Ch—— of Engl—— is not all over Angelical, All Purity. For my part, I would have it declar'd by the Church, *That Faith and Repentance are requir'd, as Conditions and Covenants in Persons Baptiz'd at Tears of Discretion*, who can, if demanded, answer judiciously what *Faith* is, and what *Repentance* is also. And to such Persons only this Answer ought to be limited, when the Question is put, *What is requir'd of Persons to be Baptiz'd?* For as to *Infants*, and the Reason of *their Baptism*, I think such an Answer as this would be sufficient, *viz. Infants are Baptiz'd, because according to Christ's Institution, they are here, as by a Sign, publickly declar'd to be Members adopted into the Christian Church, by which Adoption they acquire, an inward and spiritual Grace, as some will believe, tho' perhaps, others will say, they attain no such Grace, till they come to Knowledge of*
riper

riper Years, so as to understand the Duties of Faith and Repentance. Now, suppose we find two such *different Beliefs*, shall *They* be a Ground of Separation? I do not see that it ought so to be, any more than the Erecting of a May-pole, if Both esteem it *Sacramental*.

This Answer I take to be full and sufficient, and furthermore, that the care of Infants Education in the Christian Religion be committed *primarily to the Parents*, who are bound by the Laws of Christ to educate them in Christianity, that they may learn when they come to riper Years what *Faith and Repentance is*. St. John the Baptist, or our Saviour himself, cannot be suppos'd to *preach Repentance to Children of 8 Days old*, who had committed no *actual Sin*, or was capable of Repentance. But their Exhortation and Call was, to Persons of *Understanding and Years*, who were able to do those Duties of Repentance and Faith; or be sorry, if they did not do them, as they ought. The General Command, in my Opinion, is enough to justify *Baptizing Infants*, in whom Original Sin is wash'd away; (as some say, tho' others controvert) which Infants, when they are told at Years of Discretion by their Parents, if living, or some Friends (who were present at their Baptism) that they were Baptiz'd into the Christian Church, will

will be prompted to enquire what Duties belong to Baptism; and if their Parents, or Educators, do not rightly instruct them, their *Pastors* and *Teachers* ought, in order to breed them true Christians. This is the natural Consequence of this Institution. For the Obligation by *themselves* made, when *Infants*, or that of their *Sureties*, seems to have no Tye, or Influence in the least, on either. Nay, if we examine into Matters, as Things are now settl'd in a National Church, the whole use of *Sureties*, or *Godfathers*, ought to be laid aside, inasmuch as the Reason of them ceases. For the Primitive Christians mightily encreasing, became a Terror to *Pagan* Princes, upon which they being jealous of their Growing Power, prosecuted them even to death, and endeavour'd to destroy, and root them out of their Kingdoms wherever they settl'd. Now Christian Parents *under* Persecution, having Children, procur'd *Sponsores*, or *Sureties*, to see their Children Educated in the Christian Faith. If they surviv'd the Parents, who were in Jeopardy daily to be murder'd for their Religion. Now, God be thank'd, we are a National Church, out of all danger, I hope, of being *persecuted to Death* for our Religion, and the Parents not in daily hazard, or dread of being murder'd for it; So the reason of nominating *Sureties* ceases, and the Parents

rents only may *now safely, and properly ought,* if living, to be *Godfathers and Godmothers*, to take care of the Education of their Children.

But whether this Expedient, by excluding the *Sureties* at the Font, leaving off the Sign of the Cross, and declaring the Sense of the Church to be different in Baptizing Infants, from that of Baptizing Persons of riper Years, will be sufficient to make a Coalition of the *Anabaptists* with our Church, I am not able to determine, only this good Effect it may have, to demonstrate to the World, that the Church is willing to meet *Them* half way, and join Hand in Hand, provided they do not *avowedly make Priests, as Jeroboam did of the meanest and most illiterate of the People.* And also, if they can be persuaded to Christen their Infants, tho' without the Ceremonies of the Church, according to Christ's *General Institution* and Command, tho' they make an Ecclesiastic Ordinance, that those Infants so Baptiz'd shall give an Account (which their Parents or Pastor shall promise to demand of them, and require, when they come to Years of Discretion) of their Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of Repentance, without being rebaptiz'd. For to urge but one Argument on this Head——Suppose *Infant Baptism* were needless, and the Child be Baptiz'd, no Injury

jury can be done to the Child, or Sin committed by the Person Baptizing. For Christ's *General Command of Baptizing all Nations* (of whom Infants must be a part, and inclusively meant, unless our Saviour had declar'd the contrary) imports it *Lawful*, tho' they cannot give an Account of their Christian Faith *Themselves*. Nor does it appear, that our Saviour or St. *John the Baptist* (the first Preacher of the *Baptismal Institution*) could ever *possibly* require it of Infants, as above undeniably prov'd. I think therefore if it may be *lawfully* done, why should it be insisted on as a Breach of Union not to *suffer* it to be done? Or not to communicate with a Church that will not do it in every Ceremonial Circumstance, as they would have it done? Again, if a Child die in its Infancy, tho' some may think *Baptism* in that state *needless*, yet because it admits of a *Doubt*, whether it be so or no, and the Arguments incline rather on that side, which declares it *necessary*, than otherwise, why would any prudent Man omit that Duty, by doing of which *Imputative Righteousness* may be through Christ's Merits attributed to his Child, tho' he cannot, or will not be sure, it is *so ascertain'd*, in order to the Remission, or washing away of Original Sin. Now if the advantages on one Hand be so considerable to an Infant, and the Disadvantages

rages, in all probability, so great in case that Infants die unbaptiz'd, as *unless ye be Baptiz'd, ye cannot be sav'd*, why should any Party, or Body of Men, put Things thus to an Hazard? Especially if the Church declare their different Reason of Baptizing Children, and Persons of riper Years. Infants cannot think of depending on *Araham for their Father*, or indeed on Christ himself for Salvation, whilst they are Infants, much less are they able to bring forth *Fruits meet for Repentance*, before they are Baptiz'd; but I humbly conceive they ought, by this necessary Institution of Baptism, as a *Declarative Mark or Badge*, that they are receiv'd into the Christian Church, To have the Grounds of their Faith, and the Doctrine of Repentance, frequently inculcated to them by their Parents, or Pastors, to be rightly Educated in the Principles of Christianity.

Thus have I summ'd up, in brief, my Opinion concerning *Infant-Baptism*, and so short also, that *he that runs, may read*. If it provoke some Men to Anger, because its a small *Scheme of Union* (if practicable) I cannot help it: My Intention is not to Quarrel at the Institution of the Church, but to be better satisfied in the reasonableness of that Institution in *that manner* as it is. I am hardn'd against *unjust Calumnies*, and oburate against *Scandalous Reproaches* for my Opinions,

ons, and if any shall heap up Coals of Fire on my Head, in order to melt me into a Retraction of any rude Saying, or ill Design, in my Writings, none shall be more ready to do it upon a just Conviction than I will: But if, as holy David expresses it, *My Soul be among Lions, and I lie among them that are set on fire*, to destroy me in my Secular Advantages by false Insinuations, and opprobrious Representations, *Even such Sons of Men whose Teeth are Spears and Arrows, and their Tongue a sharp Sword*, Ps. 57 v. to such Men I say, I can make this easy Reply, *That Sub incude & malleo etiamnum durabo*, In spite of unreasonable Back-biters, I shall find the Approbation and Countenance of many pious and good Christians. If what I have said in this, or any other of my Writings, give a just Offence to any Person, or Body of Men, I am heartily sorry for it, but if by endeavouring to discover the Truth, I am become their Enemy, and am also notwithstanding that Endeavour, in the wrong, it is my Misfortune, and not my Fault. Therefore I would desire my Reader to hear both Parties, if he conceives me guilty of giving just Offence, for it is an old, and very true Saying, *Qui cunque statuit aliquid, parte inauditâ Altera, licet æquum statuerit, iniquus est Judex*, He that hears but one side, where an Accusation is brought, tho' he determine

the Case according to Justice, yet he cannot be accounted a *just Judge*, if he determine it before he has heard both. Now this I am forc'd to add, because these who seem to *most dislike*, and are *most inveterate* against my Opinion, are such who *professedly own* they *never read them*, but with great Fervency have heard them rail'd at, and expos'd in the Pulpit, the unreasonableness of which Dealing I will farther examine into, when I come to consider the Consequences of these Opinions. And this Controversy of Baptism, I had not in the least touch'd upon, did not the Nature of the Subject lead me thereunto, and if I have err'd in that also, I should be heartily glad of some better Head to reform my Erroneous Judgment.

LETTER

LETTER III.

A Comparative Disquisition between the Scriptural, and Philosophic State of the Dead, together with an Examination of the Good or Bad Consequences, that necessarily flow from the Opinions of Mr. Dodwell, or Me, concerning the Nature of the Soul, is so requisite in this Case, that I think they ought not to be omitted. Because the First will show how from Hea-thenism, the Substantiality of the Soul took its Rise, and the Latter will plainly evdence my Fourth General Proposition, VIZ. That I have not done the least Injury to Religion, or Christianity.

WHAT I have said in my First Letter, concerning the Opinions of divers great Philosophers, relating to the Nature of the Soul of Men and Brutes,

I shall not here again repeat, but leave my Reader to consider, and reflect upon the Passages here mention'd, and to tell me whether he met with any fine *Encomiums* in Scripture, concerning the Soul of Man, as *its being snatch'd up into the circumlucid Region of the Moon, wrapt in an Etherial Vehicle, sent down from thence to serve in Mortal Bodies, to Operate therein for a Time, to dwell in several Zones of the World amongst the Zoned Gods, to descend down to the Earth with flagging Wings,* with abundance more such Romantic Qualifications. Which sufficiently testify that the *Chaldeans*, or ancient *Ægyptians* (Nations much addicted to Astronomy, and from whom such Expressions seem naturally to be deriv'd) have broach'd this Notion of the *Soul's being a distinct Substance from the Body.* Mr. T——d in his second Epistle to *Serena*, is very positive that this Notion originally sprung from the *Ægyptians*, and from very good Authority of *Herodotus*, who liv'd long in *Ægypt*, and who had opportunity to search into their Antiquity and Opinions, he being himself one of the ancientest Historians in the World, derives it from *Egypt*, pag. 40. so that I presume it for granted, after the indefatigable pains by Mr. T—— taken in that Letter to find out its original, that we need not seek for any other, to prove the *Soul's Existence and Immortality* by.

Now

Now as they devis'd the Existence of this *Spiritual Self-Subsisting Being*, so the first Immortality they gave it, seems (as I have elsewhere observ'd) to be no other than a *Perpetual Living in the Bodies of some Men, or other, unto the World's End*, commonly call'd the *Transmigration of Souls*. Which Doctrine was of so great Antiquity, that its Original could never be discover'd by History. *Doctrina Melepsychoſe, ſive de Exiſtentia, & Revolutione Animarum, &c.* ſays Dr. Burnett in his *Archæolog. Philoſoph.* The Doctrine of the *Transmigration, Pre-exiſtence and Revolution of Souls* is very ancient, and as univerſal as any, when it not only prevail'd in the *Eastern World*, but in the *Western*, among the *Druids, and Pythagoreans*. This Doctrine, I ſay, as if ſent from *Heaven*, without *Father, or Mother*, and without any Original known, ſpread over the whole World. Nevertheless we cannot prove by *Philosophy*, That the Souls are *Præ-exiſtent to the Bodies*, or return often into them, pag. 192. and ſo in ſeveral other Places of that moſt excellent and Learned Treatiſe.

Next to this Authority of the abovemention'd Judicious Author, who has undeniably prov'd it to have been an original Doctrine of the *Druids* (certain Priests of the *Heathens*, who ſpread themſelves over *Germany*, nay, over all the World, in very ear-

ly Days) I come to insert that of *Helvicius* in his Chronology, who says, *Hermionis tempore Collegium Druidarum floruit, i. e. In the Time of Hermion there flourish'd a College of the Druids in Germany*, which is computed to be *An. Munt. 2148*, about 484 Years after the Flood. Now if so ancient a Nation, or People of the *Druids*, held a *Transmigration of Souls*, that *Transmigration* must necessarily infer, that they held it to be a *Spirit*, or *Spiritual Substance* distinct from *Body*, before it could pass from *Body* to *Body*. And *Moses* could never instruct those *Heathen Nations* in such a Doctrine, because by all concurrence of the most ancient Writers in the World, it's prov'd to be a Doctrine many Hundred Years before *Moses* was born: That flourishing College of *Druids* being, according to comparative Chronology, about 226 Years before the Birth of *Moses*.

After this Existence so establish'd by ancient *Heathen* Philolophers, the next Thing was to endow it with suitable Attributes, or Proprieties. The first of which was *self-subsistence*, and the second, *Immortality*, which two noble Qualifications when they had bestow'd on it, what might they not confer on it likewise in respect of so glorious a Nature? *Self-subsistence*, as it gave it an independent Nature on any other Being, so *Immortality* gave it the Nature of a God in respect

pect of Duration. For the *Immortality* Heathens bestow'd on *Human Soul*, was not such as our Modern Writers call erroneously *Dependent*, or *Præternatural*, as continued so in its Immortal State by God. But it was a *Natural Immortality*, or its Principles were such, that by *them only* it would subsist for everlasting. At first in mortal Bodies only by constant Vicissitudes and Revolutions, as a Punishment, But afterwards as Philosophy grew more in Vogue, they invented *Tartarus* an Hell, and *Elysium*, a Place of Delight for the Residence of Bad or Good Souls after death, with Torment, or Pleasure, attending them *Orpheus primus cecinit*, &c. *Orpheus the Poet was the first that sang of Hell, and the Elysian Fields, Seats of the Wicked and the Righteous Souls, Rewards and Punishments after Death, promising them after the Expiration of this Life, Felicity or Happiness in another.* Archæol. Philos. 121, 122, 126. &c. Hence among the Jews, there was a Sect call'd the *Essens* or *Esseni*, whose Opinions concerning the Soul, he avers to be taken out of *Homer* or *Virgil*, two excellent Heathen Poets, who asserted, That the Souls, as soon as they were loos'd from the Fetters of the Flesh, as if freed from Long-slavery, did presently rejoyce, and mount up on high. The Good live in a Place beyond the Main Ocean, that is neither troubl'd with Snow, Heat, or

Showers ; but a gentle Breeze always springing from the Sea, fans and delights them, pag. 264. The like Difficulty plung'd many of the Christian Primitive Fathers, tenacious of their first Philosophic Principles, that they could not embrace Christianity as consistent with *their Human Learning*, without erecting a middle place for the Reception of Souls after Death, in room of *Elysium* and *Tartarus* of the ancient *Heathens*, which they look'd on to be *too gross Notions* for Christianity to Countenance ; because most of those deify'd Great Men sent to *Elysium*, were notorious flagitious Men. Hereupon, many Fathers believ'd the Circle of the Moon to be *Paradise*, and there the Good Souls to reside until the Resurrection ; others an *Hades*, as Mr. *Dodwell* cites them, with Poets and Orators of *Heathen* Original, a Place of Darkness in the Upper Regions of the Air, appointed promiscuously for the Souls of Good and Bad Men, after their Separation from their Bodies.

As soon as this Doctrine was receiv'd into the Primitive Church, no wonder if the Scriptures were tortur'd and wreck'd to abet it, tho' originally invented by Philosophers, supported by Poets and Orators, and infus'd into most Men's minds from them by the Principles of Education. *Maximus Tyrius* (says Mr. *T——d*) affirms with *Cicero*, that *Pythagoras*, the Samian, was the first amongst the

the Greeks, that durst maintain, that the Body only died, and that the Soul was Immortal, neither subject to Age, or Corruption, and that it existed before it entred into the Body, pag. 29. Afterwards Plato, Thales, Anaximenes, and divers other Philosophers, too long here to repeat, embrac'd the same Opinions, but originally deriv'd from the Fathers of the first Learning in the World, the Egyptians, in whose Doctrines Moses is said to be skill'd, Acts ch. 7. v. 22. and consequently this Notion of the Soul cannot but reasonably to be originally Egyptian. Whoever has a mind to be farther satisfied in this point, let him but read the xth Chap. p. of the Book call'd *Second Thoughts concerning Human Soul*, and the *Second Letter to Serena*, and in both these he will find sufficient Arguments from undoubted Authors of Antiquity to convince him, if he will hearken to Reason, and their Authorities, besides what I have above-mention'd.

Having thus traversed the Opinions of Heathens concerning the *Soul's Separate-self-Existence*, and its *Immortality*, I must add the Words of Mr T——d on the same Subject ——— This (says He) was the State of the *Soul's Immortality* amongst those Nations, who were not illuminated by Divine Revelation. The People begun it, from them their Children learnt it, and at last it became a part of All
Mens

Mens Education (as it happens to *Opinions* generally receiv'd) and so the *Learned* themselves Believed it, before they had a Reason for it. 'Tis true the *Vulgar* embrac'd it afterwards (as they do still) upon Trust, or from Authority: But not so, the *Philosophers*, who offered Arguments for the *Soul's Separate Existence and Immortality*, pag. 54. Whereupon notwithstanding these Disquisitions, we ought humbly, as *Christians*, to acquiesce in the Authority of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who brought Life and Immortality to light through the Gospel. Where he would have done well, when He had mention'd that Word *Immortality*, to have explain'd whether he meant *Immortality of Distinct Souls*, or of *Men* rais'd to Life at a general Resurrection, because that hidden Doctrine was made manifest to Us by the appearing of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who hath abolished Death, and brought, &c. 2 Tim. i. 10. Wherefore if Common Opinions rais'd by the *Vulgar*, and improv'd by *Heathen Philosophers*, are so demonstratively prov'd to be the Original of this *Substantial Soul of Man*, I think it but highly reasonable to examine whether it quadrates with *Divine Revelation*.

But before I come to examine this, I will give you a short Scheme of Rewards and Punishments, they, in their Writings, allot too Good and Bad Souls, so like a Romance,

or fictitious Scene in Plays, the two grand Debauchers of Principles in Youth, that the like scarce can be parallell'd.

As for those Souls, who were rewarded, some of them were turn'd into Stars or Constellations, others wander'd about after separation in pleasant Fields; call'd *Elysian Fields*, where the Ghosts of the Deceased *Wanton'd and Revell'd* in Pleasures; some took the same delight in Arms, Chariots and Horses after Death, as when Living. Others being *cloath'd in Air*, and wandring up and down the Earth, bestow'd Wealth and Honour on their Favourites Living, as plentifully now they are Dead, as before. Some again associated themselves with the Gods, and Eat and Drank plentiful with them (but these were generally the *Souls* of Princes and Emperors) on a Food call'd *Ambrosia*, and a Liquor call'd *Nectar*, the Liquor of none but Gods. Others again took Airy Flights round the Universe, and appear'd as *Spectrums*, or Ghosts, to encourage the Good, or terrify the Wicked, or to Reveal something relating to the Subterranean and unknown World, or Things otherwise not to be found in this. The first of these Gods, who inhabited Heaven, is said to be *Saturn*, and next to Him *Jupiter*, and his Wife *Juno*. All Men or Women, formerly Living, and by Common Fame, and no otherwise, Immortaliz'd

mortaliz'd or Deify'd. From whence I take the Original of Canonizing Popish Saints to be deriv'd.

Those Souls, who were assign'd over to Punishments, were condemn'd to a Pit, or Place call'd *Tartarus* or Hell, wherein were three stern Judges, *Æacus*, *Minos* and *Rhadamanthus*, who exercised their Authority over Wicked Souls, by severe Punishments. Condemning one to Roll a Stone up an Hill *perpetually*, which naturally tumbld down again; Another to have a Vulture Eating or Preying *continually* on his Bowels or Liver; a third to be *eternally employed* in turning a Wheel, a fourth to be set in a River up to the Neck, and to have Apples always bobbing at his Mouth, yet never able to catch one of them, &c. concerning this Place, it is said to have six large Rivers, comprehended in this Verse.

Styx, Acheron, Phlegethon, Lethe, Cocytus, Avernus.

Over the first of which a Ferry-man call'd *Charon*, wafts the Souls of the Deceased, and has a *Naulus*, or Penny, for his Pains, to carry them over to the *Elysian* Fields on the other side the River; the Ground, perhaps, of the present putting a *Penny*, call'd a *Peters Penny*, into the Mouths of the Deceased,

ceased, who dye in the Romish Church, to pay *St. Peter*, who is said to keep the Keys of Heaven, for their Entrance in thereunto. But if some *Souls* happen to be separated from the Bodies by a violent Death, then they must wander about The World for an hundred years, before they can be admitted to be waisted over to the *Elysian Fields*. Murderers are condemn'd to the River *Phlegethon*, call'd by *Plato* *Periphegethon*, and others to *Lethe*, a River of Great Slowness, and that brings on the Ghosts a *Perpetual Oblivion*, call'd in the Scripture Language, *A Land where all Things are forgotten*. Other *Souls* are said to be purify'd with *Brimstone*, deriv'd, no doubt, from the Ancient Custom of *Purifying Houses* from the steams of Carcasses, out of which the Deceas'd were carry'd. Again, they us'd among the Dead another *Purification of the Souls*, which was done by a *Laurel Branch dipt into Water*, with which they sprinkled the Souls, with abundance more of such Foolish and Ridiculous Heathen institutions. The Original, perhaps, of *Holy Water* uted by the Papists, to give a *Purity* to Persons entring into Churches, or to drive away Devils out of the Possessed (dipt not in any of the aforementioned Rivers undoubtedly for that Use) sprung from this Custom in all probability. All which Customs relating to *Funeral Rites*,
and

and the *state of the Dead*, as deriv'd Originally from the Ancient *Ægyptians*, if *Diodorus Siculus*, the Father of Historians may be Believ'd, Mr. T.—d has very briefly summ'd up in one of his Letters to *Serena*. 'The
 ' *Relations of the Body that is to be bury'd*, acquaint before-hand the Judges, and the Kindred as well as the Friends of the dead Person with the Day of his Burial; and after telling his Name, they certify that he is at that time to pass over the Lake. After this there assemble above forty Judges, and sitting in a certain Semicircle, prepared on the side of the Lake, the Boat, which is provided in the mean while by those to whom that Care belongs, is brought thither by the Ferryman, whom the *Ægyptians*, in their Language, call *Charon*. Wherefore they say that *Orpheus*, having seen this Custom when he had formerly travel'd into Egypt, compos'd his Fable about Hell, partly imitating these things, and partly inventing out of his own Head. Then *Diodorus* goes on to tell that every body may accuse or defend the dead Person, who, if he be prov'd to have led a bad Life, is deny'd the usual sort of Burial. From this Prohibition of Burial in *Egypt*, which was afflicting to the Living, and scandalous to the Dead, the *Greeks* (and from them the *Romans*) had their Notion, that the Soul of the unbury'd were disquieted, and cou'd
 not

'not pass over the River into the *Elysian*
 'Fields, turning a noble Practice into a
 'senseless Fable. Hence you may likewise
 'perceive how they came by the Notion of
 'infernal Judges, which Office they be-
 'stow'd on *Minos*, *Æacus* and *Rhadaman-*
 'thus, the most just Princes among the
 'Greeks. But not to digress, if any false
 'Accuser appear'd, he was severely pu-
 'nish'd; and if none accus'd the Dead, then
 'he was put into his Coffin, and his Rela-
 'tions throwing off their Mourning, made
 'a solemn Panegyrick, not magnifying his
 'Dignity or Family, but commending his
 'Education, Piety, Justice, Temperance,
 'and other Virtues. After relating more
 'particularities to our purpose, *Diodorus*
 'makes this most judicious Observation.
 'The Greeks, says He, in their commentiti-
 'ous Fables, and by their celebrated Poets,
 'have disguiz'd the Truth of these things, as of
 'what relates to the Honour of the Just, and
 'Disgrace of the Wicked; and therefore they
 'have bin so far from being able by these means
 'to lead Men to the best sort of Life, that they
 'are themselves despis'd by the Bad, and deri-
 'ded for their Folly. But among the Egyp-
 'tians, the Punishment of the Wicked, and the
 'Recompence of the Good, not being contain'd in
 'Fables, but exhibited to our Eyes, each Par-
 'ty is every day put in mind of their Duties;
 'and

and by this Custom there grows the best, and
 most useful Reformation of Manners. Lower
 in the same Book he gives a Catalogue of
 such celebrated Greek Philosophers and Le-
 gislators, as were initiated in the Egyptian
 Learning; and repeats again, that Orpheus
 brought from thence the greatest part of the
 mysterious Rites (us'd in Greece) with the
 Orgys that are celebrated at their Expi-
 ation, and the Fictions of Hell. Somewhat
 lower again, he, that was an Eye-witness,
 assures us, That the Meadow, which was
 the feign'd Habitation of the Dead, is a place
 by the Lake call'd Acherusa near Memphis,
 which City is surrounded with most beautiful
 Meads and Groves of Lotus and Calamus.
 Nor is it improperly said that the Dead inha-
 bit those places; for that the greatest part, and
 the most sumptuous of the Egyptian Burials
 are made here, the dead Bodies being trans-
 ported over the River and Acherusian Lake,
 and laid there in Grots made for that purpose.
 The other Fictions of the Greeks about Hell,
 do likewise agree with those things which are
 to this day perform'd in Egypt; for the Vessel
 for transporting the Bodies is call'd Baris,
 and a piece of Money to the value of an Obulus
 is paid for fraught to the Ferry-man, who, in
 their Country Language, is call'd Charon.
 There is also near those places, as they say,
 the Fane of darksom Hecate, and the Gates of
 Cocytus

'Cocytus and Lethe made fast with brazen
 'Bolts. There are also other Portals of Truth;
 'and near these the Statue of Justice without a
 'Head. There yet remain among the Egypti-
 'ans several other things that gave occasion to
 'our Fables, keeping still the same Names, and
 'the same Actions being perform'd. Here's a
 'most natural Account of the Rise of those
 'Poetical Fictions concerning the Elysian
 'Fields (Charon, and his Passage-mony, with
 'the different Mansions of departed Souls,
 'and the several Portals of Hell. All other
 'Origins are false, manifestly absurd and
 'precarious. From which short Scheme, so
 'curtly, and succinctly drawn, of the *Philoso-*
phic State of the Dead, I pass on to consider
 now the *Scriptural State of the Dead*.

After Adam had Forfeited the State of
 Innocence, He became Subject to Death, by
 Eating the forbidden Fruit, *Gen. ch. v. 3.*
 For which Offence He, and all his Posterity,
 Patriarchs, and others, All, except *Enoch*,
 dyed. And we read nothing in the least of
 their *Death being a Separation of the Soul from*
the Body, but as the Tree fell, there it lay.
 All along, the whole Tenor of the Scripture,
All in whom was the Breath of Life, which God
 gave to every Living Creature, were by the
 Flood destroy'd, except *Noah*, and his Family,
 and there was an end of them. The first
 time we meet with *Soul*, to relate to a Li-

ving Creature, is that place which mentions Rachel's death, Gen. 35. v. 18. *And it came to pass as Her Soul was departing, for she dyed, &c.* which happens only from a wrong Translation, and not the Word it self; becaule in the Original Hebrew, nay, in the Greek and Latin, the Word signifies no more than *Life*. But if it had, this doth not prove the Soul's *spiritual Substantiality*, or its *Immortality*.

The next thing to be observ'd in relation to the Dead, in Scripture, is that of *Moses*, who died, and was Buried in a Valley in the Land of Moab, Deut. 34. v. 6. Yet he is said afterwards to talk with Our Saviour. *Behold there talked with Him Moses, and Elias*, Luke 9. v. 30. who appear'd in Glory and spake of his [Christ's] decease, which He should accomplish at Jerusalem, v. 31. Now if *Moses's* Apparition had been a Spirit (as the Soul is said to be a *Spiritual Substance*) it must have been *Invisible*; If it had not had solid parts, It had not been able to talk. But this Appearance of *Moses* was seen, and talk'd as the Disciples testified; When God, as a Spirit is said to talk, the Scripture says God answer'd *Moses* by a Voice, Exod. 19. 19. that is God made use of a Sound to adopt himself to be understood by Mortal Nature. So Matt. 3. 17. Lo, A Voice from Heaven, call'd a Sound from Heaven, Acts. 2. 2. But when Angels appear,

pear, as *Moses* and *Elias* undoubtedly were, they are said to use all the Actions, and Gestures of Men, as *Gen.* 18. v. 2. *ch.* 32. v. 24. *Judges*, 6. v. 11. *ch.* 13. v. 11. *Acts* 8. v. 26. *ch.* 12. v. 7. So that these must be the *Persons* of *Moses* and *Elias* Glorified by God's special Favour, and exalted to Heaven from the Grave, [*Moses*] before a General Resurrection by the Power of Him who rais'd *Lazarus* from the Dead, *John*, 11. 43. and many Saints that appear'd with Him after His Resurrection, *Matt.* 27. 52. who Himself is the Resurrection, and the Life, and whosoever Believeth in Him shall Live, tho' he dye, *John* 11. 25. Being a good Encouragement for all Men to live pious and strict Holy Lives, so become *Favourites of Heaven*, in order to enjoy an antecedent Resurrection to Life Everlasting as *Moses* did.

Now you may remark what a perplexity Philosophy hampers the Judgment with, and what shift is devis'd to evade the force of the Authority of the Scriptures. Here say they, *This must be the Soul of Moses, wrapt in a Body of Air, to make him a Spirit, visible to Human Eyes, because his Body was buried in the Land of Moab.* Do's not any one see now plainly, that this must be a Philosophic Devise, or Trick, to make a Spirit wrapt in a Body of Air? Don't the very Expressions prove it? Besides, seeing 'tis so positively deter-

min'd by such, as call the **Soul**, a *distinct Substance*, able to exist separate from the *Body*, let them but bring one single Instance of *Fact* to prove a *Spirit* so wrapt; or cloath'd with its *Aerial Vehicle*, and I'll believe *All* true. But as it is but a *meer guess*, its impossible to be prov'd, *tho' one rose from the Dead*.

But perhaps, the *Soul* of *Samuel*, may be urg'd as a Proof, 1 *Sam.* ch 28. when it was rais'd from the Dead by the Witch of *Endor*. To which I answer, suppose it was a *Real Apparition*, its impossible to prove it *Samuel's Soul* wrapt in an *Aerial Body*, unless we take that for a Proof, *because it was Visible*, when in good Reason and Sense, that is an undeniable One, that it was *not a Spirit*? And besides, I'll give you these Reasons of the Thing being a Juggle.

1. Because she is call'd in the Hebrew *Ob*, or *Mistress of the Bottle*, that is, a *Pythonisse*, or one that had got the Art to make her Voice sound as if it came out of her Belly, by which means she did all her Tricks.

2dly, She must be a Cheat, and necessarily know *Saul*, who was *Taller by the Head and Shoulders than any Man in Israel* at least, tho' she never saw him before; if a Witch, she could not but guess it could be none but him.

3dly. She

3dly. She must be a Dissembler, because she pretended to call up *whom be had a mind to*: Whom shall I bring up unto thee?

4thly. When she saw *Samuel*, she cried with a loud Voice; now if she saw *Samuel* (known to all *Israel*) why did she answer *Saul*, when he ask'd her, *What sawest thou? I saw Gods Ascending and Descending*; those God could not be *Samuel*, whom *Saul* desired her to Raile.

5thly. If they were both in the same Room, how comes *Saul* to ask her, *What seest thou?* If *Samuel* was not visible to *Saul*, as well as the Witch, he either was Blind, or she told him she saw *Samuel*, and so impos'd on him.

6thly. Again she cried with a loud Voice when she saw *Samuel*, What needed she to cry so vehemently to make *Saul* hear her, if they were together in one Room?

7thly. The next thing *Saul* says, *Be not afraid, What sawest thou?* That is, tho' now thou knowest me to be *Saul*, who have destroyed all the Witches in *Israel*, yet be not afraid, Thou shalt receive no hurt, because I have sworn, if thou tell me *what thou sawest*. So it's plain by the Question, *Saul* saw nothing yet, but desired to be inform'd what she saw.

8thly. The Woman that before saw *Gods* (to magnifie her Art) now saw a *Man* cover'd

ver'd with a Mantle, but *Saul* saw him not yet, by his next Question, *What form is he of?* Which Question he would not have put, if his own Eyes could have been made Judge. Thus all along it appears *Saul* perceived not that it was *Samuel*, by his own Eyes, but by the Relation and lying Report of the Crafty Woman: And as the Woman told him *Samuel* was there, so he bowed and stoop'd to the imaginary Apparition; for the whole Text plainly intimates, That that poor despairing deluded King, hoping by any way to get Comfort to his distracted Mind, seeing God neither Answer'd him by *Urim*, *Thummim*, or *Prophets*, never saw any visible Apparition.

Thus much for the *Soul* of *Samuel*, whom it was as impossible for a Witch, an Instrument of the Devil, to raise from the Dead, if he was one of those *Righteous Men* (as we may reasonably presume He was) who rest from their Labours, Revel. 13. 14. as it is for that *Prince of the Air* to extort that Peculiar Power from God himself, as being able to cause a Resurrection of the Dead to Life again.

Thus the Word *Soul* having prevail'd amongst our Translators of the Bible, where it ought not to be so, has been a great Occasion of so many Sticklers for it, to make the Scriptures mean *Soul* in a Philosophical Sense, when as it ought not to be so interpreted.

pretered. Thus when it is said, 1 Kings, ch.
 xvii. 5. *The Child's Soul came into him*
again; as if it meant some Spirit return'd
into the Body again: It is a wrong Con-
struction, and meaning, because nothing
could return, but what was gone from Him,
and that was only His Breath, as it is ex-
pressed, v. 17. His Sickness was so sore, that
there was no Breath left in Him. This is the
 Scriptural meaning of the Word *Soul* in very
 many places of the Bible, tho' otherwise er-
 roneously interpreted, as any one versed in the
 Original Language, in which the Bible was
 wrote, may evidently see.

That *Death* is call'd a *Sleep*, in Scripture,
 and that the Kings of *Israel* are said to *sleep*
 with their Fathers, when they died, cannot
 be denied. Now if so, we all know that All
 our Senses in sleep are lock'd up, so that we
 neither *Hear, Feel, Smell, Taste* or *See*, much
 less can *understand* any one Action, or Thing,
 whatever. Now, according to Heathen Phi-
 losophers, our *separate Souls* do every one of
 these Actions, *i. e.* are capable of enjoying all
 the Pleasures imaginable, and *Plato* tells you
 positively, *That the Union of the Body to the*
Soul, is a great Obstacle to its Knowledge, which
it has in far greater degrees in its separate State,
vide Phædon. But where have we any such
 Scriptural Information of the *Souls Plea-*
sures and Knowledge in a separate State, when

the Man is Dead, which I think must reduce Him to many Degrees of Insensibility beyond that of Sleep? When the Scriptures speak of Mans dying, it says, *Man lieth down, and riseth not till the Heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their Sleep, Job xiii. v. 12.* And consequently *Man*, and not only his *Body* must be in a State of *insensibility* until the Resurrection. Again, *As the Sons of Men dye, so die the Beasts, as one dyeth the other, Eccles. 3. v. 19.* without a Translation of the Soul of *Man* or *Beast* to a separate State of Existence. Thus again, *In Death there is no Remembrance of thee, in the Grave, who shall give thee Thanks? Ps. 6. v. 5. Wilt thou show Wonders to the Dead, or shall the Dead praise thee, Psal. 88. v. 13.* To which Questions Holy *David* himself gives the Answer, *The Dead praise not the Lord, neither they that go down into Silence, Ps. 115. v. 17.* So again, there is no *Work* nor *Knowledge*, nor *Wisdom* in the Grave, Eccles. 9. 10. meaning by the Grave, after thou art Dead there can none of those attributes be ascrib'd to thee, tho' the Heathen Philosophers say the contrary, as above-mentioncd. Moreover, the Place to which the Souls of the Deceased are consign'd, is call'd a *Pleasant-Place*, an *Elysium*, as before describ'd, or a *Tartarus*, a Place of Torments. But the Scriptures make the

the Place of the Dead promiscuously the same, calling it a *Land of Darkneſs, and Shadow of Death*. A *Land of Darkneſs*, as *Darkneſs* it ſelf, and the *Shadow of Death* without any Order, and where the *Light* is as *Darkneſs*, Job x. v. 21, 22. Where *Light* and *Darkneſs* are the ſame thing, becauſe the *Dead* is ſenſible of neither, *Pſ.* 143. v. 3. In a particular manner deſcrib'd by *Hezekiah*, when He was Sick. *I ſhall not ſee the Lord, even the Lord in the Land of the Living, I ſhall behold Man no more with the Inhabitants of the World. For the Grave cannot praiſe thee, Death cannot celebrate thee, they that go down into the Pit cannot hope for thy Truth,* *Iſaiah* 38. v. 11. 18. Yet we are told, that the ſeparate Souls of the Deceas'd, go immediately after *Death* to an *Aerial Hades*, or *middle State* in the Air, who may there undoubtedly praiſe the Lord, if they pleaſe, tho' their *Bodies* be *Dead*, becauſe they may have *Faith and Repentance* preach'd to them alſo, if *Mr Dodwell* ſays true, even in that ſtate of Separation.

I paſs now on to conſider the *ultimate ſtate of the Dead*, according to the *Doctrine* of the Holy Scriptures; where I find as to *Puniſhments*, that there is a *Worm* that never dieth, and a *Fire* that ſhall never be quenck'd, *Mark* 9. 44. *There ſhall be Weeping and Gnaſhing of Teeth, with outer Darkneſs,*
Mat.

Mat. 8. v. 12. Now whether this *Σκότος*
ἐσκότισον be that Darknes, which is next
 the Heavens, as Mr. Dodwell is pleased so to
 call it (but does not prove it any more than
 by conjecture) or whether it may mean
Hell, where the Devil and his Angels are
 reserved in *Chains of Everlasting Darknes*,
 Jud. 6. and 2 Pet. 2. 4 in opposition to that
Darknes in the Grave, I will not pretend to
 determine, but the latter exposition I think
 most reasonable. Yet, if these are the Pu-
 nishments, they are all recited (except those
 to the Devils) to be inflicted after the Gene-
 ral Judgment, when *Death shall flee from the*
Wicked, and Men shall seek Death, but cannot
find it, Revel. 9. 6. *tho' they call to the Rocks*
and Mountains to cover them, Luke 23. 30.
 Revel. 6. 16. and hide them from the wrath
 of the Lord at that Day, v. 17. So again
 the Promises of Rewards are not limited to
 any *middle State*, but are mention'd to be
 after the Resurrection, or, at that very time
 when the Dead shall generally be raised.
The Lord himself shall descend from Heaven,
with a Shout, with the Voice of an Archangel,
and with the Trump of God, and the Dead in
Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive,
and remain, shall be caught up together with
them into the Clouds, to meet the Lord in the
Air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord,
 1 Thessal. ch. 4. v. 16, 17. Here is no men-
 tion

tion of the *re-union of Soul and Body*, but they which are *Living Persons* then, shall be exalted with the *Dead*, called those that are *Asleep*, v. 15. in *Christ*, in a glorious manner to the Heavenly *Jerusalem*. Where *God* shall wipe away all *Tears*, and there shall be no more *Death*, neither *Sorrow*, nor *Crying*, neither shall there be any more *Pain*, Revel. 21. v. 4. Why therefore should any good Man think it an hardship if he dies, not to go immediately in his *Soul* to *Heaven*, if he be so Good and Righteous as to secure his *Salvation*, and go at the time by *God* appointed? Its plain, I think, that the *Scriptures* ascertain no other time, or manner, than as before-mention'd; and it is as plain, that the Reason why Men believe otherwise, is because *Philosophic* prejudices have bewitch'd us.

I am not ignorant that many, tho' not of the *Romish* Church, pretend to demonstrate from *Scripture* Authority, that there is a *third place*, where the *Souls* of the Deceased reside until the Day of Judgment. Now the necessity of their feigning such a *third place*, does not proceed directly from the *Scriptures*; but they are forced to compel some *Scripture* Texts to speak on their sides, or else *Souls* must go to *Heaven* or *Hell* immediately, which would invalidate the necessity of a future Judgment; at least, they do not know what to do with the *Souls* of
the

the Deceased, if they do not find out some *Repository* for them. This made the Heathens imagine Souls by a violent Death, rent from Bodies, set them a straggling a hundred years up and down the Universe, before the Poor unhappy Vagabonds could be admitted to pass over the River *Styx* into the *Elysian Fields*. Our Romanists purge these *Immaterial Substances*, or Spirits by Fire, and for that end have amass'd many Texts, where the Word Fire occur'd, to prove that *Purgatorial Fire*. The chief of which are these, *Zacch.* 9. 11. *Mal. ch.* 3. 1 *Cor.* 3. v. 13, 14, 15. *Mat.* 5. v. 27. *ch.* 12. 32. And to back these Texts they call in the Authority and Exposition of several of the Fathers of the Primitive Church. And undoubtedly so they may, to prove any absurd Opinion can be broach'd in Religion, if you have liberty to make them speak, as well as the Holy Scriptures, as you would have them. This Doctrine of *Purgatory* being a large Field of Controversy, I think needless to handle here, in relation to the Punishment of Souls in a middle State; because I never yet saw it prov'd from the Authority of Scripture, that any Souls are *Substances*, capable of existing in a separate State, and until that be prov'd all the Disputes about a *Purgatory*, and *Prayers for the Souls* of the Deceased, must fall necessarily to the Ground.

Others

Others insist upon that Text of *St. Peter*, where our Saviour is said to *Preach to the Spirits in Prison*, 1 Pet. 3. 19. which Authority Mr. *Dodwell* mightily depends on; tho' in my Opinion without a real Ground for his Exposition, and thereupon gives a satisfactory Account (as He imagines) of our Saviour's *Descent into Hell*. This Text is frequently quoted by the Romanists, to justify their *Purgatory*, or at least *Praying for the Dead*, or *Souls of the Dead*; but how a Protestant Writer came to be so great a Champion for a *third Place*, as a *Repository of Souls*, from this Text, I cannot conceive. Now were I of no Sect of Religion, I would have all, who pretend *plainly*, and *literally* to expound this Text, to tell me *How they conceive a Spirit can be imprison'd*? Its evident they *All* refer to a *Local Confinement*, who expound this Text; and Mr. *Dodwell* has given the Imprison'd Souls a very large extent, *viz.* The *whole Upper Region of the Air*, next the Circumference of Heaven, which to me looks like Imprisoning the *Great Turk* in his two and thirty Kingdoms. But tho' Mr. *Dodwell* has been so kind in his Imprisonment, others are not; but have sent them to the very *Center of the Earth*, where they all stand crouded and uneasy, which is part of the *Wicked Soul's Punishment*. This is
the

the Opinion of a Jesuit of the Romish Church, who has also to the best of my Remembrance, been so nice as to calculate the Dimensions of that *Central Place* of Torment in the Earth, to show that it is capable (as He has devis'd their standing thick and close) of holding all the Wicked Souls that shall be damn'd in an hundred thousand years, if I forget not his exact Time of Calculation of the Duration of the World. Now this Gentleman makes it a *Prison* indeed, and a severe one too; but yet He has not resolv'd me, and I doubt, no Man can, why these *material Barriers* (of Water perhaps in the Center of the Earth) *should keep Spirits in confinement*? I cannot think but that these *Spiritual Substances* would be able to penetrate even through the strongest Rocks imaginable, nay rend them asunder; so much for the *absurd literal Exposition* of this Text. For He that will take a view of it, will plainly see, that it refers, as Dr. Hammond rightly observes, to those *Persons* who liv'd in the Days of Noah, That Preacher of Righteousness, 2 Pet. 2. v. 5. To whom Christ (as God) by the *Holy Ghost*, or *Holy Spirit* Preach'd. For, says He, Christ having suffered for Sins, the Just for the Unjust: (That He might bring us to God) being put to Death in the *Flesh* [or dying as He was Man] but quickned or rais'd to Life again by the power of

of the Holy Ghost] or by the Spirit. By which Spirit [or Holy Ghost] also He went and preach'd to the Spirits in Prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the Long-suffering of God waited in the Days of Noah, v. 19. 20. For which reason he says in the following Chapter. For this Cause was the Gospel preach'd also to them that are dead, that they might be judg'd according to Men in the Flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit, ch. 4. v. 6. From which Text, if you please, you may extort an Argument to prove Christ's preaching to the Dead, tho' it is plain, the Apostle means, to those the Gospel was preach'd, when they were living, but are since that Preaching dead. And that *Spirits* denotes *Persons* in Scripture is evident, 1 John 4. v. 1. 2. 3. and so in several other places. Wherefore *Spirits in Prison in the Time of Noah*, if I may be allow'd an Exposition, cannot mean *Deceas'd Souls*, but *Persons then under the Bondage of Sin*, call'd the *Disobedient* here, and the *Ungodly*, 2 Pet. 2. 5. To whom our Saviour preach'd by the Spirit. This Comment I have presum'd to give on this difficult Text, which if not satisfactory, let my Reader give a better, and I think I have beyond denial confuted the literal meaning thereof.

Lastly, as to any true Information of the State of the Dead, I meet with but one place

place directly that gives any Account thereof, which is *Luke 16.* where it is said—*The Beggar died, and was carried by the Angels into Abraham's Bosom. The Rich Man also died, and was buried, and in Hell He lift up his Eyes, being in Torment, v. 22.* and a little after, the Brethren of the Rich Man would be perswaded, if they hearken not to *Moses, and the Prophets, tho' One rose from the Dead, v. 31.* Here is the only place that seems to insinuate *Commerce with the Dead*, yet here is not one Word of *Soul* mention'd, but the *Persons* of *Dives* and *Lazarus* discoursing together about their State of Existence at that Time, the one in Misery, the other in Happiness. However, this being a Parable, can be no more accounted Argumentative, than a Simile would be; it may be perswasive to a good Life, I confess, but not cogent enough to prove *Souls* punish'd after the manner as there express'd. But if it did, it wholly takes away the Grounds of a *Middle State for the Reception of Souls* after the General Resurrection. Because in *Hell He lift up his Eyes, and in Abraham's Bosom*, will necessarily infer it to be *Heaven*, where *Abraham* was, and I believe now is. For *God is a God of the Living, and not of the Dead. Mark 12. 27.* A God of Angels, and glorify'd Saints, rais'd from the Dead to Life by his special, and peculiar Favour.

Of the Consequences of both these Opinions:

IT is as much my Wondet, as my Concern, to see how many Good, Pious, and Learned Men, seem to be inveterate against the Opinion I have publish'd to the World, in relation to the *Soul*. And I cannot see any just Reason for it, but Meerly the strong Byass of Education. I must confess, I have not gone so far, as Mr. *Dodwell* has, as to make the *General Judgment Partial*, I mean, relate to but a *Part of Mankind* only to be examin'd, and judg'd at that Day, leaving reprobate wicked *Heathens*, who never could hear of the Gospel, to dye unpunish'd in this World, or the next. This Consequence I take to be very ill, tho' he labours to vindicate it. For it not only makes God a *Partial Judge* (as the Word *Partial* usually signifies *Unjust*) but it would deter Men from embracing Christianity, as the most dangerous State they could be brought into; being thereby ascertain'd to *Immortal Misery*, which otherwise they might evade by the *Benefit of Actual Mortality*, and live deliciously in the highest Raptures of Vice. This, I say, puts such a Terror upon Christianity, that altho the Rewards are great; yet they will hardly have influence strong enough to out-balance the dread of Eternal Punishments,

O

ments, especially when both depend on *Faith* and *Hope* only, and not on *Ocular Demonstration*, which Men of some Principles require. But if they can be assur'd they shall die, and never be rais'd again to give an Account for the Bad Deeds, they will have no Obligation of a good Conscience, but do all the mischief that lies in their power, so they can but sculk behind the Laws of a National Government. Hereupon, if such an Opinion should be preach'd amongst *Heathens* and *Infidels* intermix'd with the Doctrines of Christianity, 'tis odds, but that the very dread of being *insur'd* of *Eternal Damnation*, if they liv'd not up to the Rules of Christianity, would cause them to reject the Gospel, and not venture the hazard that necessarily attended their Conversion. As to Christians, indeed, who have already receiv'd the Gospel, I do not see that their *Future state after this Life* is made better or worse by his Opinion, in respect of *Salvation* or *Damnation*, but his Notional Paradise for good Souls, intetmix'd with Bad, in the *Ades of the Air*, may tempt many Protestant *Ignorant People* (who always interpret Things in the worse Sense) to believe, that he Designs to establish the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, so long ago *justly* exploded out of our Churches. Tho', in my Opinion, the Story of his *Hades in the Air*, is

so Romantick, that even amongst *them*, it will scarce ever obtain Credit, tho' he has brought so many good Witnesses of the ancient Fathers to strengthen his Authority.

As to what he says, concerning the *Descent of our Saviour into Hell*, hinted at before, as it is an Article of our Faith, I rather believe it as the *Words* are, then canvass into the *meaning*, to puzzle my Understanding the more, as some have of late done, to explain the Mystery of the Trinity. However, it is observable from ancient Ecclesiastic Writers, that that Article of the *Creed*, commonly call'd the *Apostles Creed*, was, with very great difficulty, and hot Disputes, in the Church, superadded long after the Apostle's Time to the aforesaid *Creed*, and as it is so, so I believe it. But if I may have liberty to give my Opinion, I take it to mean no more than, That *Christ went into the Grave*, or suffered Death like other Men, and was buried. For as *Christ was God and Man* it is as unconceivable, and above our Reason to comprehend, how the *God-man* could be buried in the Grave, (call'd *Hell* oft in Scripture) as it is to conceive, how he could be crucify'd, seeing he was a *God*. According to the same Expressions in *Isaiah*, *Hell enlargeth her self, and openeth her Mouth without measure: And their Glory, and their Pomp, and their Multitude, and he that rejoiceth shall*

ments, especially when both depend on *Faith* and *Hope* only, and not on *Ocular Demonstration*, which Men of some Principles require. But if they can be assur'd they shall die, and never be rais'd again to give an Account for the Bad Deeds, they will have no Obligation of a good Conscience, but do all the mischief that lies in their power, so they can but sculk behind the Laws of a National Government. Hereupon, if such an Opinion should be preach'd amongst *Heathens* and *Infidels* intermix'd with the Doctrines of Christianity, 'tis odds, but that the very dread of being *insur'd* of *Eternal Damnation*, if they liv'd not up to the Rules of Christianity, would cause them to reject the Gospel, and not venture the hazard that necessarily attended their Conversion. As to Christians, indeed, who have already receiv'd the Gospel, I do not see that their *Future state after this Life* is made better or worse by his Opinion, in respect of *Salvation* or *Damnation*, but his Notional Paradise for good Souls, intermix'd with Bad, in the *Aedes of the Air*, may tempt many Protestant Ignorant People (who always interpret Things in the worse Sense) to believe, that he Designs to establish the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, so long ago justly exploded out of our Churches. Tho', in my Opinion, the Story of his *Hades in the Air*, is

so Romantick, that even amongst *them*, it will scarce ever obtain Credit, tho' he has brought so many good Witnesses of the ancient Fathers to strengthen his Authority.

As to what he says, concerning the *Descent of our Saviour into Hell*, hinted at before, as it is an Article of our Faith, I rather believe it as the *Words* are, then canvass into the *meaning*, to puzzle my Understanding the more, as some have of late done, to explain the Mystery of the Trinity. However, it is observable from ancient Ecclesiastick Writers, that that Article of the *Creed*, commonly call'd the *Apostles Creed*, was, with very great difficulty, and hot Disputes, in the Church, superadded long after the Apostle's Time to the aforesaid *Creed*, and as it is so, so I believe it. But if I may have liberty to give my Opinion, I take it to mean no more than, That *Christ went into the Grave*, or suffered Death like other Men, and was buried. For as *Christ was God and Man* it is as unconceivable, and above our Reason to comprehend, how the *God-man* could be buried in the Grave, (call'd *Hell* oft in Scripture) as it is to conceive, how he could be crucify'd, seeing he was a *God*. According to the same Expressions in *Isaiah*, *Hell enlargeth her self, and openeth her Mouth without measure: And their Glory, and their Pomp, and their Multitude, and he that rejoiceth shall*

Descend into it, ch. 5. v. 14. But if this my conjectural Exposition, (which indeed must be such from *All*, who cannot prove *Inspiration* to be their Guide) be not satisfactory to explain the Doctrine of Christ's *Descent into Hell*, let others more exquisitely vers'd in attempting the Explanation of Mysteries give a better, I think it, by this Opinion of Mr. *Dodwell*, no ways lessen'd, or improv'd.

As to the Consequences of my own Opinion, That *Man dies, in the ordinary course of Nature, and will not live again until the Resurrection*, unless by the special Favour of God; And that *no Man's Soul goes to Heaven or Hell, as soon as he dies, &c.* I think I have prov'd it to verifie my Fourth general Proposition, mention'd pag. 6. viz.

4. *That I have not done the least Injury to CHRISTIANITY.*

Now, if the Truth of that Opinion be not only *justifiable by*, but every way *consonant to* the Word of God (as, I hope, I have prov'd it *undeniably*, tho' perhaps *too boldly* in respect of *Worldly Interest*) what Injury is there done to Religion? As to those, who are *asham'd* to own the Truth of this Doctrine (which, if I have prov'd it by Scripture, must be true,) for fear of popular Clamour: I desire them to consider, whether I
speak

speak it of my self, or from the Word of
 God. If it be from the *Latter*, the Con-
 sequence in Christianity is very bad, and may
 be one Day interpreted a *Denial of the Chri-
 stian Religion*. For, (says Christ) *whosoever
 shall deny me [my Doctrine] before Men, Him
 will I deny before my Father which is in Hea-
 ven, Mat. 10. v. 33.* And if any one will
 contest the Veracity of the Scriptures, and
 make a *Particular Judgment* to Condemn
Souls every Day separated from the *Bodies*
 in Contradistinction to a *General Judgment*,
 in Derogation to God's *Infinite Justice*, &c. I
 think it comes as near the *Denial of Christ*, as
 any thing can be.

For as to these popular Arguments, that
 such an Opinion *delays the Judgment of the
 Wicked*, and gives them a *Jubilee* till the
*Resurrection, to preach up no Punishments till
 the Day of Judgment*, as I look on them to
 be very trivial and idle, so is the Conse-
 quence even they infer, no Injury to Chri-
 stianity; because my Opinion *ascertains the
 Wicked not to go unpunish'd at the Last Day*.
 And this is so firmly grounded, that none
 but an *Atheist* can deny. Had I, indeed, made
 a Resurrection to Life but of *one half of
 Mankind*, and pretended to prove it from
 Scripture, I think I should have broach'd a
 Doctrine of ill Consequence in respect of Re-
 ligion, and a good Life. But inasmuch, as I

(and not I only, but the *Holy Scriptures*) fully declare a General Resurrection, and Day of Judgment, to call all Mankind, Christians and Heathens, or Infidels, to Account. 'Tis but a poor Pretence for a wicked Man to think he shall have a *Jubilee* in the Grave, where he will be crumbl'd to *Atoms*, and incapable of all Pleasure or Pain; or to imagine from hence, that he may *sin on boldly*, 'tis a long time to a General Resurrection, and, perhaps, there may be none at all. For ten thousand Years is but a moment, or the twinkling of an Eye to the Dead, (who can no more judge the measure of time, than a meer Stock, or a Stone) and the Day of Judgment to him will be the *next Minute*. So that if Sinners take these *little advantages*, to encourage themselves in Sin, 'tis plain, they are *hardn'd in Iniquity*, and are resolv'd to *sin on*, *maugre* any Opinion whatever, and that they have no reason to expect *no Judgment at all*, because in their imaginary false reasoning it appears so long delay'd. No, they may assure themselves, that *the Judgment of the Lord lingreth not*, but he doth execute it too *speedily even* then, to such who must endure eternal Torments, when the Son of Man shall come with all his solemn Pomp and Glory at the General Resurrection.

Another

Another Consequence I shall mention, is the *Advantage it gives to the Reform'd Religion against that of the Papists, who maintain Prayers for the Dead, Innovation of Saints, a Purgatory to purifie Souls by fire, in order to fit them for Heaven, A Limbus Patrum, and a Limbus Infantum, all Repositories for the Souls of the Deceas'd.* Now, this Opinion of *Man's dying till the Resurrection, and being then rais'd from the Dead to be crown'd with Immortality of Glory, or Condemn'd to Eternity of Torments,* subverts totally all these Papistical Doctrines, and as it is prov'd to be no ways injurious to Christianity, so I hope it will in Time become the serious Consideration of all Protestants, in order to defend themselves against the secret and open Mechinations of such Subtle and Potent Enemies.

Besides this, there are other Consequences, which, if true, are very material, and fit to be obviated, inasmuch, as they may have an ill influence over Mens Lives and Actions. For, Suppose the Soul of Man were not an Immaterial Substance, or Immortal, yet considering Mankind has been all along taught that Doctrine, it does not seem reasonable to start another contrary to it, least it lead People into Atheism and Irreligion; for the generality of Mankind cannot search into the depth of an Argument, but conclude, if they have not an immaterial and immortal Soul, as they

O 4

have

have been taught, then let us eat and drink, for to morrow we die: Thus the Terror of a future Judgment will be taken away, Vice encouraged, and no Man for fear of God's Punishment, would have any regard to his Life and Actions.

Answ. If a Man has been bred all his Lifetime in an Error, I cannot call it Irrational, by Arguments to endeavour to reform that Error; so that it can be no reasonable objection to say, you must not endeavour to alter an Opinion in which People have been bred. If so, this would have condemned the whole Design of the Reformation, and thrown Dirt upon the Reformers, who endeavoured to convince the Papists of their erroneous Doctrines, and corruptness of their Church. And as to its leading Men to Atheism, Irreligion, or encouraging Vice, I cannot see how it will do either. For whatever is grounded on Scripture, I know cannot lead to Atheism, or be Irreligious, and I think I have sufficiently prov'd this Doctrine to be so. Besides, this Doctrine does not conclude, that Man wholly perishes, and shall never revive again, but only asserts his whole Corruption till the Resurrection, when by the Almighty Power of God, this Corruption shall put on Incorruption, and this Mortal shall put on Immortality; and consequently, he that goes on in his Sins, and enjoys himself voluptuously, has no Assu.

Assurance, from this Opinion, that he shall *totally perish, and never give account for his Actions*, but rather directly the contrary, *viz,* that is, ' That there shall be a Day of Judgment, wherein God shall judge *him, or his whole person, and all the World*, and call *Him to an account, not his Soul only*, in the presence of Men and Angels, before whom the wicked will appear with Shame and Confusion, and publickly receive, for his ill Deeds, the Sentence of Condemnation, which our Saviour will then pronounce, and not before then, *go ye cursed into everlasting Fire.* The Terror of which dreadful Sentence, will certainly make any *wise and thinking Man* to have regard to the Actions of his Life, and to consider, that altho' the evil day is put far from him for a time, (as it happens between the day of his Death, and the General Resurrection) yet it will *certainly come, in which God will convince all ungodly sinners, of all their ungodly works they have committed*; So that this Opinion cannot be termed *Atheistical or Irreligious*, seeing the *whole Man* must, and will certainly be called to an account. And to make a parallel case of things upon the Earth, suppose a Man were to lie down and *sleep* a Week, a Month, or a Year, nay, several Years, and as soon as he awak'd, were sure to be *hang'd*, I do believe it would afford him but little comfort

fort, to think that he should have so long a time to Sleep, before his Sentence were executed ; I fancy he would believe, when he awakes, that he had slept *but a little time*, and earnestly desire to sleep on, if he might, *time being*, as I said, *no measure for the Dead, but the Living only.*

Again, *This Opinion contradicts the Opinion of the Fathers ; and is such a one, that no ancient Author has asserted : Besides, the Church of England has always taught us the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul. And the Athanasian Creed mentions Man of a reasonable Soul, and humane Flesh subsisting : And in the Service of the Communion, in the Church Liturgy, it is, preserve thy Soul and Body unto everlasting Life ; therefore it is unreasonable to broach such Novelities, as neither the Ancients ever delivered unto us, or the Church of England approved.*

Ans. What the Opinions of the Fathers are in this matter, generally, I do not pretend to know, because I have read very few of them ; But if I had, I should not think it amiss to dissent, if I found a Doctrine established by them, contrary to the Principles of *Philosophy, Reason and Religion.* In the Primitive Times, St. Paul tells you, *there were many things that God winked at*, and I do not in the least doubt, but that, as they had a great deal of Piety, so their Ignorance

in Christian Doctrine was equivalent, and pardonable in nice Points thereof. St. Augustine and Athanasius, indeed, say, according to the very expressions Plato taught them, That the Soul of Man is a substance created, a spirit intelligent, invisible, immortal, incorporeal, like Angels: However, this does not bias me, nor do I think as the Fathers think; for I verily believe this Opinion to be originally transferr'd down to them from the *Heathen Philosophers*. The *Pious good Fathers* seeming (being converted from Philosophy to Christianity, as Converts usually do) greedily to embrace any Opinion which tended to the *Honour of Religion*, without any exact scrutiny into the true Grounds and Foundation of the supposed Truth, upon which this Opinion was built. Thus we find several of them embrac'd Error, especially where the case in question seem'd very dubious; and the *Papists* quote them for the abetting their *Corruptions and Innovations* in their Church; therefore the *Authority of the Fathers, without the Testimony of Scripture*, I think not sufficient Grounds to rely on.

What is mention'd in the Apostles Creed concerning the distinction of *Soul* and *Body*, as if it meant *two distinct Substances*, I have before hinted at, that it ought to be interpreted not as if the Word *Body* were put in
Con-

Contradistinction to *Soul* ; but to denote *A Comprehension of the whole Man*, as plainly appears by the same Word oft mention'd, 1 Cor. 15, and in several other places of Scripture. For altho' the Apostles did not plainly call it a *Resurrection of the Body and Soul* (that Expression being improper for a Being that never dies, or is immortal) yet 'tis as plain that by *Body*, they meant *Material Man* with all his Faculties, who, as *Job* says, *With his very Eyes shall see God*, Job. 19. 27. and not that *Lump* only of *Matter*, that shall corrupt, and be reduced to its primitive Dust. For as *whole Man* sinned, so *whole Man* must receive the Wages of Sin, viz. Death, and consequently *whole Man* be raised again.

There is another very ill Consequence in justifying the *Union of a Mortal to an Immortal Substance*, viz. *Body to Soul*, inasmuch, as it seems to lessen that Article of our Faith, concerning the *Godhead of our Saviour*. For we account, and justly too, the *Hypostatick Union*, above the reach of our Understanding, and the *Union of God and Man in Christ Jesus*, a Mystery worthy our Adoration, and as a Mystery to demand our Belief. Now, if the *Modus* of that Union be *unconceivable* and *unintelligible* by our weak Understanding, as unquestionably it is ; I presume the Grounds of it is from the inadequate Conception we have, or can form to

our selves of the *Conjunction of Finite with Infinite, Material with Immaterial*. But now by the Doctrine of the *Psychomutist*, that Difficulty seems to be taken away, and it ceases to be a *Mystery*, if we allow this *Conjunction of Body and Soul* to be the *Union of an Immortal-Immaterial Spirit to a Mortal-Material Body*. Where is then the *Mystery of the Hypostatick Union*? The *Union of the Soul and Body* no Man yet ever allow'd to be a *Mystery of Religion*; therefore either both must be reputed so, or neither; which God forbid the *former* should not be believ'd to be so, by all good Christians, as that the *latter* shou'd give us grounds to question the former.

The Conclusion of the whole is this. As I have here shown the Opinion of Heathen Philosophers, guided purely by the sight of Nature, concerning the Nature of the *Soul* in general, and also of *Human Soul* in particular, so I think it evidently plain, that they walk'd in *Darkness*, and in the *Shadow of Death*, as I may say, grop'd blindly after the Knowledge of that *Immaterial Being* they had devis'd, which made them ascribe very oft such trivial and ridiculous Qualifications to that *Separate-existing Spirit*, as above recited. How then ought we to adore the Immense Goodness of God, who has been pleas'd to reveal his Will to us in several *Abstruse*

struse Points, and instruct us in a Doctrine so necessary, and so conform to Infinite Justice, I mean, *The Doctrine of the Resurrection*, which all our Reasoning, all our Philosophy, could never have made out. We might, indeed, by Philosophy have accounted for the Original of our Being, by tracing it up to some one First Cause, by whose Power we must be made; But then here also would have arose a new Stumbling-Block, whether we were not coævous in a manner with that First Cause; I mean, whether that First Cause, as soon as it had Existence it self, did not *immediately* make *Man*, or whether it delay'd its Creating *Man* for several Thousands, nay, perhaps, Millions of Years, after the whole World was form'd, &c. Yet that *Man* could not make Himself, we are by Philosophy ascertain'd; but when we come to argue about the *possibility of the Reproduction of Man*, once moulder'd to Dust, and reduc'd to Putrification, our Reason then must of necessity be bewilder'd, and all our Philosophy prove vain and useless, as being a Doctrine, unless we recur to Omnipotence, not comprehensible by a Finite Understanding. Thus, I hope, these Consequences and Considerations being well weigh'd, there *will*, nay, *cannot*, for the future, be any *just Grounds* of promoting Calumnies, and unworthy Reflections, for broaching such Opinions,

nions, which are not *in themselves* the least derogatory to Christianity, or can be construed as injurious to a Good Life, or to have a Bad influence on Religion in general. And, as for most of the Objections I have met with as yet, I cannot forbear saying, that I have, with an impartial Hand and Heart, *weigh'd them in the Balance, and found them too Light to over-bias my Reason into a Conviction.*

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for J. Chant-
try, at *Lincolns-Inn-Square,*
by *Lincolns Back Gate,* near
the Fields. Written by the same
Author.

S*Econd Thoughts concerning Human Soul,*
demonstrating the Notion of *Human*
Soul, as believ'd to be a *Spiritual* and *Imma-*
terial Substance united to *Human Body,* to be
an Invention of the *Heathens,* and not con-
sonant to the Principles of Philosophy, Rea-
son, or Religion. The Second Edition, Cor-
rect and Enlarg'd.

* * The *Grand Essay,* or a Vindication
of Reason and Religion against Impostures
of Philosophy, proving, according to those
Idea's and Conceptions of Things, Human
Understanding is capable of forming to it
self.

* * * 1st. That the *Existence* of any *Imma-*
terial Substance is a Philosophic Imposture,
and impossible to be conceiv'd. 2^{dly}, That
all Matter has originally created in it a prin-
ciple of Internal, or Self-motion. 3^{dly},
That Matter and Motion must be the Foun-
dation of Thought in Men and Brutes: To
which is added, a brief Answer to Mr.
Broughton's Pneychologia.